

**ORIGINAL ENGLISH EDITION**

APR 30 '26

# The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 488

APRIL, 1926

Vol. 246

- I. Queen Victoria. By John Bailey
- II. What Ails the Engineering Industry? By W. F. Watson
- III. The Partridge. By Douglas Gordon
- IV. Newman in Fetters. By J. F. Mozley
- V. French Taxation and the Franc. By Bernard Mallet
- VI. Thoughts on Food, Health and Strength.  
By Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane.
- VII. Dante and Giotto. By W. J. Payling Wright
- VIII. The Rule of Law. By Hugh H. L. Bellot
- IX. The Friendship of Great Britain and the United States.  
By R. B. Mowat
- X. The Passing of the Liberal Party. By a Privy Councillor
- XI. The Register of Archbishop Parker.  
By The Very Rev. the Dean of Winchester
- XII. The Real Naval Incubus.
- XIII. Some Recent Books.

Published Quarterly by the

**LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY**

(ROBERT J. SPENCE, PROP.)

249 WEST THIRTEENTH STREET, NEW YORK.

Single Copies \$1.50

Yearly Subscription \$5.00

Canada Subscription \$5.00 per year; Single Copies \$1.50

Entered as New York Post Office as Second Class Matter

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

# Educational

## SCHOOLS

### College of St. Elizabeth

Convent Station, New Jersey  
45 Minutes from New York

### Catholic College for Women

Registered by Regents

### Standard College Preparatory Courses

Academy of St. Elizabeth

Send for Catalogue

### University of Southern California

LOS ANGELES

Comprises the following schools and colleges: Liberal Art, Law, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Music, Speech, Commerce and Business Administration, Religion, Social Welfare, Education, Graduate School, Metropolitan College.

Located in the largest city on the Pacific Slope. President, Rufus H. von Klein Smid, A.M., Sc.D., D.M.C.P., Ph. et Litt.D.

For bulletins, address Registrar, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

### CHEVY CHASE SCHOOL

Residential school for girls. Senior high school, with two years advanced work beyond. Twelve-acre campus. Address CHEVY CHASE SCHOOL, Box N.

FREDERIC ERNEST FARRINGTON, Ph. D.,  
Headmaster,  
Washington, D. C.

### RUTGERS PREPARATORY SCHOOL

RUTGERS PREPARATORY SCHOOL has maintained a continuous service for 160 years preparing boys of cultured families for college life and good citizenship. The equipment is complete and modern. Limited to 100 selected boys. Affiliation with Rutgers University offers many advantages. Catalogue and views.

WILLIAM P. KELLY, HEADMASTER  
NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

## SCHOOLS

### Saint Mary's School

### Mount Saint Gabriel

PERKSKILL-ON-THE-HUDSON, N. Y.

### Boarding School for Girls

Under the charge of the Sisters of St. Mary

New fireproof building beautifully situated

For catalogues address *The Sister Superior*

### NEW YORK MILITARY ACADEMY

CORNWALL ON HUDSON, N. Y.

A famous preparatory school  
with a magnificent equipment  
and an ideal location.

FOR CATALOGUE WRITE TO THE PRINCIPAL

### Learn Languages

Private and Class instruction in all modern languages. English included. Skilled native teachers. Reasonable tuition. Day and Evening Classes. Enroll at a

### BERLITZ SCHOOL

In New York, Brooklyn, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Detroit, Chicago,

### HOME STUDY COURSE

for out of town students. Write for particulars to New York Berlitz School, 30 West 34th

### SEVERN SCHOOL

A country boarding school for boys. Ideal location on Severn River near Annapolis. Preparatory College, West Point and Annapolis. Exceptional thorough work given and demanded. Students taught how to study. Water sports and all athletics. List to fifty. Catalogue.

ROLLAND M. TEEL, Ph. B., Principal  
Boone, Md.

## GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

### Self-Revealed

A brilliant discussion of G. B. S. and the drama, by the author of *Saint Joan* and his Boswell. Beginning in the April number of the FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

75c a copy, \$7.00 a year

### LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.

240 WEST 13th STREET

NEW YORK



THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 488.—APRIL, 1926.

Art. 1.—QUEEN VICTORIA.

1. *The Letters of Queen Victoria (Second Series). A Selection from Her Majesty's Correspondence and Journals between the years 1862 and 1878.* Published by authority of His Majesty the King. Edited by George Earle Buckle. In Two Volumes. Murray, 1926.
2. *Idealism and Foreign Policy. A Study of the Relations of Great Britain with Germany and France.* By A. A. W. Ramsay, Phil.D. Murray, 1925.

It is not inappropriate that the two new volumes of Queen Victoria's Letters should appear within a few weeks of the funeral of Queen Alexandra. The engagement of the Prince of Wales and the coming of the Princess are among the first events discussed and described in the new Letters. And throughout the two volumes the Princess makes not infrequent appearances. There is indeed only one political controversy in which she is at all involved, the Schleswig-Holstein affair. But the births of her children, and above all the dangerous illness of her husband, were political events, and her relation to her husband's mother was a political fact: so that even in this politically restricted selection from the Queen's correspondence, she inevitably has at least an occasional place. More than that she could not have: for she had neither the inclination, nor the ability, nor the opportunity for engaging in the domestic and foreign political activities which are the almost exclusive subject of these volumes. Nor had Mr Buckle any opportunity to speak of her in the lucid and admirable introductions with which he has prefaced each section of the Letters.

Vol. 246.—No. 488.

Her part lay almost entirely outside the sphere of the Queen's correspondence as these volumes present it. But it is not too much to say that without her the Queen could not have lived the life we here see her living. The two women, who always felt for each other a beautiful motherly and daughterly affection, were, in fact, except in their goodness, entirely unlike. And that was the Queen's great good fortune. What she would not do, what she persuaded herself that she could not do, her son, and above all her daughter-in-law, did as it had never been done before. The Queen did not encourage them: did not, it is plain, ever fully perceive how important it was for her and for England that they should do what they did and be what they were. But the fact remains. The Queen did not escape reproach and something like partial unpopularity for her obstinate refusal to make more than the rarest appearances in public during the first ten or fifteen years after her great sorrow. How far would that unpopularity have gone if she had not had a son of incomparable tact and urbanity, a daughter-in-law of the rarest beauty and charm, to replace her at the innumerable ceremonies and functions by which Royalty now gathers a whole people round it and makes itself the visible centre of the national life? 'Replace' her is not perhaps the right word: they could not replace her and did not try or wish to do so. She and no one else could be the Queen. But they never forgot that or allowed others to forget it. Their perfect loyalty and affection kept them from ever playing at any kind of rivalry with her: they never for a moment aimed at being more than her dutiful children and deputies and, as faithful deputies, they carried to her credit all they won of affection and loyalty, and laid it at her feet. Probably only Royal personages fully know the gulf which separates a head which has been crowned from any other, however near it in place or kin. That has, of course, often led to bitter jealousies and even to ugly crimes. But in this, happy case it only led to a grown man who was no fool, and a grown woman who was one of the beauties of her generation, submitting patiently to a kind of supervision which ordinary young people escape when they leave school; and to their gladly and gracefully doing in the name and to the

honour of the Queen whatever she did not wish to do herself. No doubt they partly liked it: certainly the Prince enjoyed Mayfair and Newmarket, entertaining and being entertained: and the Princess would not have been feminine, or even human, if she had found no pleasure in the universal admiration which her beauty (and her dresses!) everywhere aroused, and in the universal affection which she won and kept to the day of her death. But many of the functions at which they had to take the Queen's place must have been dull enough. And now that we have laid the Princess of Wales (to give her the title which she bore so long and as no one else ever bore it) in her grave it is right to remember how much Queen Victoria and all of us owed to her and to the Prince whom we afterwards knew as Edward VII. Their gifts were the necessary complement of the Queen's. Without them she might have failed. They helped her to make the transformed Monarchy not only possible but triumphant, by providing it with the active ubiquity and popular visibility without the balance of which dangers might too easily have lurked in the Queen's life of obstinate retirement and devoted but entirely invisible industry.

That is the life which these two new volumes once more depict. After her husband's death the Queen tried to rule this country by incessant reading and writing. An absentee from her capital and her Ministers, she tried, by an endless and indefatigable industry, to make her pen do the work which properly belonged to her voice and presence. So we see her here writing letters to her Ministers day by day, sometimes several in a day, first to Palmerston and Russell and Derby, and then to Gladstone, Disraeli, Salisbury and the second Derby. And all this was in addition to a continual correspondence with foreign personages like her uncle and cousin, the first and second Kings of the Belgians, and her married daughters, especially the Crown Princess of Prussia. There are also occasional letters to foreign Sovereigns, with whom she was less intimate, such as the first German Emperor, the Emperor of Russia, and the King of Italy. And there are many Memoranda written by the Queen and many extracts from her journal. The whole gives a very detailed picture of the

public and political history of England and indeed of Europe between 1862 and 1878, so far—and that includes a great deal—as the Queen played any part in it. We have had that history told us by Lord Morley with Gladstone as the central figure, and by Mr Buckle with Disraeli. Here we have it told once more by Mr Buckle, or rather by the Queen herself and her correspondents, as she and they saw it at the time, and largely from the point of view of her concern in it. Mr Buckle's part in the book has been the all-important one of selecting from the vast stores of material placed at his disposal by the King, and of providing brief introductions to each chapter and occasional explanatory notes. In all this he has followed the example of Lord Esher and Mr Benson who edited the earlier volumes: and, though of course no selection can ever be completely judged by those who do not know what was rejected, it is at least certain that in what he has given us, and in the introductions and notes which he has provided for it, Mr Buckle has performed his difficult task with the accuracy, skill, and judgment which his name had led every one to expect. He seldom, perhaps never, expresses any judgment of his own on the successive controversies, home and foreign, which are discussed in the letters which his introductions precede. The self-effacing modesty, which he perhaps carried too far in his *Life of Disraeli*, is here obviously the right editorial spirit. We get enough facts about Schleswig-Holstein, Reform, Irish Church, and the other subjects of the letters, to enable us to understand what the Queen and her correspondents wrote about them: for a judgment on their views and actions Mr Buckle leaves us to ourselves.

The selected letters are almost wholly political. But they are letters, not State-papers; that is, they are not dead but alive. And therefore we get from them an impression of the character and personality of the Queen and the other writers, especially Palmerston, Granville, Gladstone, Disraeli, and the Crown Princess. That is inevitable in reading a long series of letters on whatever subject. *Naturam expellas furcâ*: you may forbid a man to write to you on any subject except finance or metaphysics, but he will not be able to keep himself out of his letters. Certainly the Queen is always

present in hers: and even more certainly the letters which she received from Disraeli bear his signature in every sentence, almost in every word. But all we see of all the writers is seen through the glass of politics: whatever is not political is an accident or a digression. There are here scarcely any letters from the Queen to her children except to the Crown Princess: and none of a private and personal character. There are few allusions to her private habits and pleasures, tastes and eccentricities such as form the most delightful feature in the letters which have achieved immortality, even in those which, like Cicero's and Horace Walpole's, are largely political. We are told nothing of what the Queen ate and drank, very little of her clothes, very little of her getting up and going to bed, nothing at all of her visits to her children's nursery, almost nothing at all of any idleness or self-indulgence or amusement, in or out of doors. The widow is indeed very visible in the earlier letters: and the mother and grandmother later on. But the widow, broken-hearted as she is, speaks here chiefly as the lonely Queen who has lost the strength and stay of her counsels: and the mother thinks of her sons and daughters less as her children than as the future Princes and Princesses of England. These volumes are a contribution to English history: they are not a collection of familiar letters. Perhaps familiarity is impossible to Sovereigns, and was especially so to one who had been a Sovereign from her childhood. In any case there is nothing of it here. The Queen had her affectionate and devoted private friends: she is known to have been the most devoted though not perhaps always the wisest of mothers; Gladstone's testimony, written at Balmoral in 1863, is confirmed by all other witnesses: 'Anything more beautifully domestic than the Queen and her family it is impossible to conceive.' But neither home nor friendship have any place, or only the smallest, in these volumes. Their world is neither nursery nor boudoir nor garden. It is Windsor and Westminster, England and Europe. Their subject is not the woman: it is the Queen.

They show us the Queen taking an active part in the discussion of all policies and projects of her Ministers. On nearly all the greater questions which came up for



decision she held, and pressed upon her Ministers, very definite opinions. This was especially the case in Foreign Affairs, with which she was often in closer touch than her Ministers, not always to her advantage. She had been cradled, one may almost say, in a school of Foreign Affairs: for no one knew more about the problems of Europe than her uncle Leopold who was her constant adviser from her childhood and lived till she was nearer fifty than forty. That personage, as virtuous as he was astute and as astute as he was virtuous, owed his unique knowledge to a unique position. He was one of those cosmopolitan figures once so common among soldiers and statesmen and ecclesiastics, now extinct, and, even in the 19th century, found only among Royal families. Perhaps Leopold was the last of them in one way, and Napoleon III in another. As Napoleon was French (or Corsican) by birth, Swiss, German, Italian, and English by education and residence, and Spanish by marriage, so Leopold was German by birth and education, English by his first marriage, by a long residence and by the fact that his sister was the mother of the Queen and his nephew her husband, French by his second marriage, and Belgian by adoption and kingship. He had lived long enough in England, at first with the prospect of being the husband of the Sovereign, to understand his niece's position as a Constitutional ruler and give her sensible advice, especially in her first years of youthful and unmarried inexperience. But of course he was a Belgian and a European, not an Englishman, and his chief interest in the affairs of England concerned foreign policy rather than domestic. Like everybody else in this book, like Palmerston, Russell, Gladstone, and Disraeli, like the Queen and the Crown Princess, he is shown by his letters to have very often completely misread the situation. In particular like everybody else he feared Napoleon III too much and Prussia too little. Like everybody else he disliked Bismarck, but like everybody else he was very slow to discover the absolute indifference to truth, honour, or justice, the cynical selfishness, cunning and brutality of that personage. It is easy for Miss Ramsay, in her interesting and even brilliant study of 'Idealism and Foreign Policy' which covers exactly the same period as these Letters of Queen

Victoria, to pour contempt on the folly of English and other statesmen who failed to perceive that in 1864 and 1870 the danger was not Napoleon III but Bismarck, and that in 1876 the danger was not Russia but Germany. She is right in her conclusion but wrong in her contempt. Fifty years after the event it is, or seems, always much easier to see the right policy than it ever can be at the time. So Lord Rosebery in 'The Last Phase' ridiculed and abused Hudson Lowe and Lord Bathurst. But if he had been in Lord Bathurst's place, and had been the statesman he is, he would have acted exactly as Lord Bathurst acted. Lord Bathurst could not tell that Napoleon was too ill for action: and, indeed, it is doubtful whether he was. And as to the improbability of his escaping the history of the world is full of the unlikeliest escapes from the most inaccessible prisons. The plain duty of Lord Bathurst was to make absolutely certain that the man did not again get out and deluge Europe in blood. So here we must put ourselves much more than Miss Ramsay does in the place—which means in the time—of the Queen and her Ministers. She is very contemptuous of the general stupidity which did not foresee the danger which grew and grew till it produced 1914. But, after all, men must be judged by comparison with their contemporaries; it is not fair to condemn them by contrasting their mistakes with the easy wisdom of historians writing fifty years after the event. So while Miss Ramsay ridicules the blindness of Russell and Clarendon and quotes their letters and despatches in proof of their folly, she really provides her own refutation. For she cannot quote any one who at the time foresaw the danger which she now represents as plain. Even Morier, whose ability she continually praises, who knew more of Germany than any Englishman, who knew Bismarck well, and was later on to cross swords with him successfully, even Morier regarded him so late as 1866 as a mere *fou furieux*, or even 'as a straw floating upon the current of public opinion.' Miss Ramsay, in fact, overlooks the general belief, which was not confined to England, that only free institutions could survive, and that Bismarck must, sooner or later, be defeated in his war with the Liberals of Germany. He was not defeated by them. And yet, after all, in spite

of his triumphant career, in spite of the unscrupulous cleverness with which he duped every country in turn, may we not now say when we look at Germany, Austria, and, above all, at Russia, that that belief only erred by antedating the consequences of despotic government? Russia and Austria were already very weak by corruption and incompetence when the day of danger came. In Germany there was competence enough. The country was the strongest in Europe. But what Bismarck had begun others had completed, with all his falsehood, with a good deal less than his cleverness. The German Government by its arrogance and duplicity had aroused universal distrust, and had therefore to fight against half, or more than half, the world in arms. The military machine fought splendidly. But when at last it was defeated there was nothing else to fall back upon. Bismarck and his imitators had made the German State, but in making it they had destroyed the German people. They had fulfilled the prophecies of the German Liberals and the fears of the Crown Prince; for they had undermined the monarchy; and, what was more important, they had so injured the character of the German people that the task of creating a political Germany has had to be begun afresh by the people whom they most despised.

But to leave Miss Ramsay and return to the Queen. What part did she play in the successive crises of this period? There were seven of them: and perhaps the results of her action in each of them may be summed up—though of course for the full truth such summings up require many qualifications and explanations—by saying that in the first two, the American crisis and the Schleswig-Holstein business, she kept us out of war: in the third and the seventh, the war of 1866 and the crisis of 1877, she nearly brought us in: in the fourth and fifth, the Luxemburg scare of 1867 and Bismarck's attempt to make a new war on France in 1875, her determination that England should not 'abdicate her position as a Great Power,' and her judicious use of her opportunities of private approach to William I, materially helped to save Europe from Bismarck and war. Finally, in the fifth of these crises, that of the Franco-Prussian war, neither she nor England played

any important part at all. One of the first letters printed in this selection is from Palmerston to the Queen announcing the American agreement to release Slidell and Mason: and the peaceful issue of this acute crisis was of course largely due to the alterations which the Queen, at the dying Prince Consort's suggestion, had inserted in Lord Russell's draft note. A little later her vigorous protests, in alliance with Lord Granville, had a great deal to do with preventing Russell and Palmerston going to war with Prussia and Austria about Denmark. This was no doubt largely due to her German feeling. But, whatever may be thought of the very poor figure cut by England in this and other affairs during the Ministries of Palmerston, Russell, and Gladstone, the Queen had no responsibility whatever for the practice which at that time did most to bring us into unpopularity and contempt. Having a much more European mind than her Ministers, especially Russell, she constantly deprecated the habit, dear to Lord John, of dispatching lectures, warnings, and threats in every direction without any intention of making them good if they were disregarded. There is no doubt whatever that if her Ministers had listened to her England would have escaped much odium and several unpleasant rebuffs. The Queen, in fact, may not unfairly be said to have been the exact opposite of her Ministers. She never lectured and she never bullied. But, on the other hand, she would rather fight than submit to a rebuff. She disapproved of their giving so much offensive good advice to Germans about Schleswig and to Russians about Poland. And she equally disapproved of their bullying and bombarding defenceless Japan. But when Prussia finally threw off the mask and proceeded to force a war on Austria and annex for herself the Duchies torn from Denmark, the Queen, who was German but not Prussian, was \* apparently anxious to intervene against her even at the cost of war. And so in 1877 and 1878, when she thought Russian policy both hypocritical and aggressive and a Russian victory a grave danger to this country, she was violently bellicose and tried to force Beaconsfield to get

---

\* Miss Ramsay says she was 'ardently in favour of war with Prussia.' This goes far beyond any evidence in these Letters.

rid of the doubters and declare for war. She was wrong, no doubt. But her reluctance to bully Japan and her readiness to stand up to Prussia and Russia compares favourably with the rival system too often followed by her Whig Ministers of bullying weak countries like Greece, China, and Japan, and retreating before Powers who could defend themselves.

What is to be said of her general attitude in foreign policy and of the share she personally took in it? If it is to be summed up in a phrase, perhaps the truest is the hackneyed 'peace with honour.' She was not at all warlike or aggressive and would scarcely have been able to understand the mind of a man like Bismarck who continually intrigued, plotted, and lied with the deliberate object of bringing about wars which would promote the aggrandisement of Prussia. She was eager to intervene, and as we have seen did so successfully more than once, to avert the horror of war. She did not greatly love the Americans, but impressed upon her Ministers the desirability of going as far as possible to meet them, though not at the cost of letting them fancy we were afraid of them. And her temper was not merely pacific but humane, and hated war even where it brought no dangers. Hearing of a suggestion that a Burmese village should be burned in retaliation for a massacre of a ship's crew, she desired her Ministers to set themselves utterly against the practice 'of imitating the barbarities of a half-savage people rather than of setting them the example of a policy founded on Christian principles.' She rebuked the insolence of Englishmen towards the natives of India. So she was careful not to hurt the sensitiveness of the humblest servants: ordering Sir Theodore Martin to omit a passage from his book which she thought might hurt a footman's feelings. But with all her humanity and love of peace she united a national pride and courage which Queen Elizabeth could not have surpassed. If a foreign army had ever set foot in this country the very last person to think of surrender would have been the Queen. Like everybody else, even the Crown Prince and Princess who had better reasons of suspicion than any one, she was slow to penetrate the duplicity of Bismarck. The person who read him best from the first seems to have been



the younger Lord Derby. To him everything in Bismarck, his adventurous audacity as well as his falseness and brutality, must have been equally repellent. And both in 1867 and in 1875 he appears to have suspected Bismarck while others were suspecting France, and he saw before anybody else that Bismarck's whole policy was built on stirring up quarrels between his neighbours and continually troubling the European waters for the purposes of his own fishery. The Queen always disliked Bismarck intensely: indeed she disliked Prussians in general: 'odious people the Prussians are, *that I must say*,' she writes as early as 1865; while, later on, *à propos* of the marriages of Princess Louise and the Duke of Connaught, and contrary to the opinion of the Prince of Wales, she opposed any more Prussian or even German marriages. So her wish for the future William II, too disastrously unfulfilled, was, in the words of her beloved Albert, 'that he should not grow up into a "conceited Prussian."' But so long as Napoleon III lived she, like Palmerston and English statesmen generally, even after 1866, feared and distrusted him much more than the upstart Bismarck and his upstart country. It was not till the crisis of 1875 that she began to see and tell the Crown Princess that Bismarck was so 'overbearing, violent, grasping, and unprincipled' that all Europe might have to 'join in putting him down'; for, as she adds, 'no one will tolerate any Power wishing to dictate to all Europe.' But in all this she was no slower than any one else except Derby. If so late as 1870 she thought that 'a powerful Germany can never be dangerous to England but the very reverse,' it is quite unfair to blame her: there were prominent statesmen who were still thinking and saying the same thing forty and more than forty years after 1870.

It is easy to say, as Miss Ramsay says, that they were all very blind and very stupid; it is easy to make as she does very confident prophecies about what would have happened if they had followed the opposite policy. But it is not very certain that Miss Ramsay would have been any wiser than the Queen, if she had lived sixty years ago and been in the Queen's position; or even that, if she had been Queen and had carried out the policy she now advocates, it would

have had all the desirable results of which she is now so confident.

However, a writer who is only separated by a few weeks from the signature of the Pact of Locarno must pass gladly from discussing these old rivalries, however natural the suspicions and real the crimes out of which they grew. We all hope that the League of Nations and the new Pact have exorcised the spirit of Bismarck, which had its representatives in all countries, and laid the foundations of a policy which will keep in view the interests not of any one country alone but of all Europe, and gradually create an atmosphere in which it will become natural and obvious to solve inevitable international disputes, as we have long learnt to solve the disputes of private persons, by conciliation, arbitration, or legal decision.

One other characteristic of the Queen's attitude in foreign policy may be noticed. She had been no friend to the dispossession of petty sovereigns which were a necessary preliminary to Italian unity. But she does appear to have learnt the lesson which Italian unity taught, that of the doctrine which we now call self-determination. Palmerston, who liked it in Italy but disliked it in Schleswig-Holstein, might truly point out to her that it was an explosive principle which 'might be applied to break every European State into fragments.' We have since seen it do so. And no doubt the Queen's original liking for it in the Schleswig question was largely due to two things unconnected with love of the principle itself. Its application carried out the views which the Prince Consort had always held on that question. And it gave the Queen an opportunity of putting Palmerston and Russell in the wrong. Why was self-determination, she asked, so obviously right in Italy and so obviously wrong in Germany? But her conversion seems to have gone deeper than the acceptance of a tactical advantage in an argument. The words she used in 1863 are a real anticipation of the principles of 1919. 'We may imagine that our interests, and those of Europe, require that Denmark should not be reduced within too narrow limits; but it would be too much like the principle on which the old Holy Alliance acted, to assign boundaries to kingdoms, and to dispose of people

without their own consent, as may suit our own, or even European, convenience.' So a few years later in the Austro-Prussian controversy she insists that her Ministers should be guided by the same 'true English Constitutional principle' of consulting the wishes of the people concerned. And twenty years later she tried to get Beaconsfield to solve the Balkan problem on the same lines by the creation of an independent and neutral Christian State.

If the Treaty of Versailles will go down to history (as in spite of its cheap critics and real faults it will) as the first Treaty ever founded on a principle, on something higher than the mere clash of forces and interests, it will be because it set out to solve all its problems, and did solve many or most of them, on the principle of nationality and self-determination. Of that principle Queen Victoria may fairly be ranked as one of the pioneers. She had nothing whatever of the prophet in her, and, if it were possible, still less of the charlatan who commonly follows close upon the prophet. Both were very busy between 1917 and 1920. She would have distrusted the one and despised the other. But the essence of the doctrine which they preached, whether with the extravagance of enthusiasm or with the duplicity of cunning, she, sixty years before they were ever heard of, had learnt and taught in common sense and sincerity.

The whole story of the Queen's activities illustrates the advantages and disadvantages of monarchical government in foreign affairs. On the one hand, she was certainly too much influenced by her own and her husband's German sympathies and prejudices. And she was too much inclined to take a kind of general Royal Family point of view. She always saw foreign problems partly from the point of view of the Royal personages involved in them. And she had, as in France, an almost inevitable prejudice in favour of the monarchical and against the republican form of government. On the other hand, like her son both in her reign and in his own, she exhibits the great advantages which a country may derive from having at its head personages who have access to all foreign Sovereigns, can get at them without having to use a Minister as a go-between, and can say

things to them which no one outside the Royal world could take the freedom to say. So, again, a King or Queen can represent a nation as no Prime Minister can. The Sovereign is permanent, august, a living chapter of history, the child of the past, the father of the future. The Prime Minister is a transient figure on a narrower stage. Goldwin Smith was no Conservative and the very opposite of a courtier. But when Lincoln was murdered he wrote to Dean Stanley suggesting that the Queen should express her sympathy to Mrs Lincoln, adding, 'The words of a Prime Minister will be civilly acknowledged by the authorities and the Press. They will have no effect on the heart of the people.' That is the point: Prime Ministers and Presidents can seldom affect the heart, and never the imagination, even of their own peoples. A King, who knows how to use his position, can quicken the imaginations and move the hearts of all the peoples of the world.

In home affairs the Queen played generally a much less active part. During the sixteen years covered by this book there are many measures of her Ministers which met with her dislike and disapproval. But none were abandoned in deference to her objections. On the other hand, there were two measures which were introduced and carried at her instigation. She wished to be Empress of India, and though she could not get the Gladstone Ministry to deal with the matter, Disraeli was easily persuaded; and she was very slow to forgive those who opposed the Bill which gave her the title. It is known that Lord Granville for one never again enjoyed the high and intimate favour with which she had so long honoured him; and amusing stories are told (not in these volumes) of the methods she took of marking his comparative disgrace. In this matter as in others she showed that she was very human and very feminine. But few will now doubt that in taking the title of Empress of India she acted on a true political instinct, and that the new enthusiasm of Indian loyalty which was a marked feature of the next forty years was partly due to the appeal made by the assumption of the new title to the imagination of the Princes and people of India. The truth is that the Queen understood in part, and Disraeli altogether, what the Whigs ignored

and the Radicals disliked, the political power of the imagination. The other measure which owed its introduction to her personal initiative was the Public Worship Regulation Bill of which a word shall be said in a moment in connexion with her attitude on Church questions. For the rest her activities in Home politics alike in Reform, Irish Church, and other matters, were confined to using her influence in the direction of conciliation and the avoidance of party violences. She strongly urged Lord Derby in 1866 to prevent the Conservatives from making Reform a party question, and to come to some compromising agreement upon it with the Russell-Gladstone Ministry. Her wisdom, and Derby's or Disraeli's unwisdom, was seen in the immediate consequences which followed the wrecking of the Liberal Bill. She was more successful over Gladstone's Bill for Irish Disestablishment. She disliked the Bill but she saw clearly the danger of a conflict between Lords and Commons and impartially pressed both sides to be reasonable and meet each other. The situation had all the difficulties which always arise when politicians touch religious issues, and the final compromise would probably never have been reached but for the persistence with which the Queen used her conciliatory influence alike with the Government, the Opposition, and the leaders of the Church. This of course was not the last important crisis she averted; and it may fairly be said that in Home politics as in Foreign, with important exceptions in both fields, she used the unique opportunities of her position to keep rival politicians from letting their rivalries rise to the danger-point and jealous Sovereigns from allowing their jealousies to lead to war.

Mr Buckle, in his selection, has provided abundant illustration of her attitude in Church matters. In nothing did she play a greater part. No piece of legislation in all her reign was so much due to her personal initiative as the Public Worship Regulation Act which Disraeli described, before it became law, as 'a Bill to put down Ritualism.' It is rather amusing to discover that she was suggesting a Bill of that sort to Gladstone, of all men, just before he fell; telling him that she must speak openly as he 'is supposed to have rather



a bias towards High Church views himself'; and of course producing an elaborate and discursive reply, respectfully carrying the war into her country by asking what was to be done about heretical Broad Churchmen! She pressed Disraeli on the subject directly he took office, demanding legislation and refusing High Churchmen for Household appointments. Some of Disraeli's most important colleagues, notably Lord Salisbury and Gathorne Hardy, had High Church sympathies; while at least one other, Lord Derby, regarded the whole business with contempt as an affair of 'parsonic squabbles' referring to 'subjects on which we have no facts.' But the Queen drove Disraeli on, and in spite of what he describes as an 'adverse' Cabinet, a 'not well-disposed' House of Lords, and a 'hesitating and ambiguous' House of Commons, to say nothing of what she describes as the 'unwise and unprotestant line' taken by Mr Gladstone, the Bill of the Queen became law, as her Prime Minister flatteringly but truly told her, 'through the personal will of the Sovereign.' It is not one of the brightest jewels in her reputation. Even more than Tait and Disraeli she misunderstood the forces she was fighting against; and the weapons with which she armed her Protestant soldiers did no great execution on the enemy. This was no doubt partly due to the fact that some of the Episcopal soldiers went over to the rebel camp. But those who most regret the failure of the Bill can hardly argue that it was well conceived. There have always been three sections in the Church of England, the Catholic, the Protestant, and the Liberal; and the Queen did not so much as recognise the existence of the first, and cared only for the Protestantism, not at all for the Evangelicalism, of the second. Of the Evangelical School she wrote to Disraeli that 'no more narrow-minded and uncharitable people exist,' and that they drove people to 'Atheism or Catholicism.' She was in fact all through a German, or Scottish, Liberal Protestant. At the bidding of Dr Macleod she rebuked Archbishop Longley for consecrating an Episcopal Church in Scotland, which appears to be rather an extreme example of our usual practice of letting the Scots have it both ways: for no one ever heard of objection being made to Presbyterian Churches

in England. She forced Canon Prothero to resume the black gown in her parish church at Osborne: and she frequently regretted that the Reformation in England had never been 'fully completed.' To a woman of her sort to whom character, kindness of heart and common sense were the whole of religion and not much less than the whole of life, it was inevitable that the millinery, the 'dressings' and 'bowings' and other 'new, *very* dangerous as well as absurd practices' of the Ritualists should seem a mere reversion to the days before the English people put away childish things. She was one of those who feel, as she wrote to Tait, that 'unbelief can only be met by a full admission of the rights of reason and science,' and she was convinced that by that method, and that only, could the Church be saved from the double dangers of Popery and Atheism. Protestant as she was she had no liking for 'odium theologicum,' and rebuked Disraeli for promoting a notorious No-Popery clergyman. She was very active in asserting her influence in ecclesiastical appointments and disliked and checked Disraeli's habit of using them as a means of obtaining political support. She insisted that he must disregard the 'mere feelings of colleagues or votes in Parliament which are *temporary*,' and remember that 'preferments in the Church are of lasting effect for good or evil.' On the whole, with the help of Dean Stanley and Dean Wellesley, she used her influence very wisely. She occasionally did private jobs like the promotion of Duckworth, Prince Leopold's tutor, which, to 'gratify her poor sick boy,' she forced upon the reluctant Disraeli. But as a rule she acted herself on the rules she laid down for him, and thought, not of birth or influence as he was inclined to think, but of character, learning, and eminence. It was entirely due to her that Tait, the first of the four Archbishops who have changed the whole conception of the office, was sent to Canterbury in 1868 in spite of the strongly expressed objections of Disraeli, who found many faults in him, and amongst others 'a strange fund of enthusiasm, a quality which ought never to be possessed by an Archbishop of Canterbury!' Disraeli's candidate, Ellicott, would have been a disaster of insignificance. She suggested the names, apparently of Lightfoot and certainly of Church

and Bradley, for ecclesiastical promotion to Disraeli in 1868, and in 1875 her list of suggestions includes Bradley again as well as Lightfoot and Montagu Butler. Of course she tended to be a little less than fair to High Church claims, as Gladstone was to Broad Church. But both of them, Gladstone even more than the Queen, took a far higher view of their responsibilities in these matters than Disraeli who, though a Churchman and a Communicant, would not perhaps have been counted a Christian either by High Churchmen or by Low. The Queen was an Erastian and regarded her Ecclesiastical functions simply as part of her duty to England. And a very high part. For she liked to think of herself as 'Head of the Church' both in England and Scotland, was very angry with Hardy for denying her that title, and probably very little pleased when Disraeli and the Lord Advocate had to explain to her that Hardy was right; for in fact she was not 'Head' of either Church.

In these as in all other matters she had a high conception of her rights as the Sovereign of the Realm. In political matters she could hardly have a higher conception of them than the law had and still has. The Army and Navy are still the King's, the laws are made not by Parliament but by him, 'by and with the advice' of Parliament; and it is he who declares war and peace, and appoints to all high offices both in Church and State. This system could be made a reality, both for good and evil, when the whole business of the State was on a very small scale, as in the days of Elizabeth. By the time of Victoria it had become not merely undesirable but absolutely impracticable. That, in general, the Queen fully recognised, and she accepted the Constitutional limitations vaguely taught her by Lord Melbourne. But nobody, then or at any time, could exactly define what those limitations are; for they are the growth of custom and are constantly changing. She would have been scarcely human if she had not tended to take rather a large view of her prerogatives, and to maintain them with great tenacity. She did not, indeed, attempt to veto great acts of home policy as George III and George IV had done. But she rightly insisted on being informed and consulted, and some-

times gave very good advice which the Cabinet would have gained by taking, as in the matter of Lowe's match tax of which she foresaw the unpopularity. In foreign politics, where she was much more the equal, indeed sometimes the superior, of her Ministers, she took, as we have seen, a stronger line. Again and again in this book we find her compelling, often very wisely compelling, the alteration of Foreign Office despatches of which she disapproved. In 1863 she told the all-powerful Palmerston, who sometimes received her remonstrances very rudely, that it was 'her desire that *no step* is taken in foreign affairs without her *previous sanction* being obtained.' And Palmerston, whom at that moment she certainly could not have dismissed, replied with the assurance, going even further than she had asked, 'that no step of any importance, either in foreign or home affairs, will be taken during your Majesty's absence without your Majesty's previous sanction.' No doubt her strength at that moment was that she knew through Granville that she had the majority of the Cabinet with her. But so late as 1873 we find her insisting, and Gladstone agreeing, that all important Bills should be submitted to her before being submitted to Parliament. In 1862 she snubbed the Admiralty for making additions to the Regulations without submitting them for her approval, and in 1863 she is very pleased with Lord Granville for making the Lord Chancellor postpone a Bill dealing with Crown livings till he had ascertained her pleasure.

All through her life, and almost without a holiday, she worked many hours a day at public business. But if the business was public her labours were private. And that was her lifelong mistake. Her Ministers, her wise uncle Leopold, her wise eldest son, all told her, but told her in vain, that royal influence was largely dependent on the royal personage being seen. Leopold, who did not like the pro-Danish attitude of the Prince and Princess, pointed out to her that the young couple were 'constantly before the public in every imaginable shape and character and fill entirely the public mind.' 'This gives them great influence in all classes': for 'the English are very personal: to continue to love people they must see them, and even in part touch them.' The

hint was obvious: but she would not take it even from the revered uncle. She clung to the shadow which involved her in nothing she did not like: she shrank back from the reality which demanded sacrifices from her shyness, timidity and love of privacy and retirement. She would not allow herself to see the inconvenience caused to the public service by her perpetual absence from London. Not even when her Ministers believed in a plot against her life and were anxious about the risks she ran at Osborne, would she come even to Windsor; and as to London, her reply was that 'to London nothing would make her go.' She *would* go to Germany when she wished, in spite of an appeal from Gladstone as to the bad effect which might be produced by her absence during a possible crisis: to places in her own dominions where public functions called for her presence she would not go. Her habits added greatly to the labours of her Ministers, as even when she was at Osborne or Balmoral she expected their frequent attendance upon her. She gave up proroguing Parliament, and seldom opened it. She complained of the trouble and expense of entertaining foreign Sovereigns. One does not wish to judge her: indeed, no one who reads her letters can help feeling for her and pitying her. She was a broken woman, a widow, and, partly because she was a Queen and partly because she had had an exceptional husband, much more lonely than other widows. She writes to Lord Russell in 1866:

'The Queen *must* say that she does feel *very bitterly* the want of feeling of those who *ask* the Queen to go to open Parliament. That the public should wish to see her she fully understands and has *no* wish to prevent—quite the contrary; but why this wish should be of so *unreasonable* and unfeeling a nature, as to *long* to witness the spectacle of a poor, broken-hearted widow, nervous and shrinking, dragged in *deep mourning*, ALONE in STATE as a *Show*, where she used to go supported by her husband, to be gazed at, without delicacy of feeling, is a thing *she cannot* understand, and she never could wish her bitterest foe to be exposed to!'

The thing had plainly got on her nerves. And then one has to remember that attempts had more than once been made on her life. The writer of this article once



heard Lord Aberdare say that she had told him he would not press her to perform functions if he knew that she was all the time in fear of assassination. And he has himself been witness of her visible alarm when an accident blocked her carriage in a London street. One cannot blame. One can only regret. It is difficult not to think that, if she would have absolved herself from some of the arduous deskwork which must have exhausted her, however much she liked it, her nerves would not have been unequal to the performance of the functions which only she could perform. That would have helped her in her real task, which was to give England and the British Empire a new Monarchy ; while all those laborious hours of reading and writing could only vainly try to continue the old Monarchy which the scale and complexity of the modern political world have placed outside present political possibilities. She did create the new, by the immense respect which her character universally inspired, by the impression, almost one of awe, which she made on the few who came into her presence, by her quite original gift of taking all her people into her confidence, by the moving letters she addressed to them in times of special joy or sorrow, by her instinct of Empire which touched dwellers in its remotest parts, by her sex and age, which ultimately made her into a kind of legend, a sort of 'divus Cæsar,' of the whole British world.

The legend and the mystery probably did more for the Monarchy in the end than any visible presence could. But they were always helped by the visible presence of her children and grandchildren. And, however successful she was, there can be no doubt that her children showed a truer Royal instinct than she in this matter of visibility. For no one can count on becoming a legend ; and the Sovereign who is unseen may only too easily be forgotten or ignored. An hereditary Sovereign can seldom, by the laws of nature, be a person of exceptional ability. His Ministers will commonly be abler than himself. But, unless his reign is very short, he ought to be able to acquire, and to deserve, a sort of influence which they can hardly ever have. The Monarchy is the permanent, the visible, the universal, the imaginative, element in our Constitution. The King is never out of office and belongs

to no party. He is not an Englishman or a Scot or a Welshman ; he scarcely belongs more to this island than to the Continent of Australia or the Dominion of Canada : he is the personification of the whole race and the whole Empire. If he knows how to use his opportunities he must acquire an experience and gather round him a loyalty which no Minister can equal. It is not his task to try, as Queen Victoria vainly tried, to play a part in all the daily details of the business of the Empire. It is his part, and it can be a very valuable one, to be a kind of exceptionally august and venerable Elder Statesman, or perpetual Minister without Portfolio ; a member of all Cabinets, who has always to be consulted on all great questions. And to those great functions he may well bring, if not an ability, at least an experience, a detachment from party, a relation to the whole people, an instinct of continuity and of the great national tradition, to which only very exceptional Ministers ever attain. His weight in the counsels of the country will not depend, as Queen Victoria too much depended, on a tenacious insistence on more or less obsolete legal rights. It will depend on the position he has won for himself in the mind of the nation and the Empire. If he is known and honoured, trusted and loved, which will seldom happen if he is not often seen, he will speak with an authority to which his Ministers cannot refuse to listen. Only he must remember what Queen Victoria forgot, that he cannot speak and they cannot listen, unless he is generally in London and frequently sees them.

All this about the Queen. It is time for a last word about the woman. Of her, however, as has already been said, the new letters tell us comparatively little. The gulf of temperament which separated her from her eldest son is again evident here, though we see a great deal less of it than in Sir Sidney Lee's ' Life of Edward VII.' Good woman as the Queen was, and full of personal humility as is shown here again and again, she did not escape the jealousy with which Sovereigns, and indeed lesser magnates, seem always to regard the sons who must be their heirs. She was an affectionate mother and he was an affectionate and very dutiful son. She calls him that, in her most

private papers, more than once, and says that he is only anxious to do what she wishes. Yet the clash, such as it was, was inevitable. She wanted him to live a dull and retired life such as she and his father liked : and it was a life that the man in him found unendurable and the Prince saw to be unwise. She does not wish him and the Princess to dine anywhere during their first season except with two or three old statesmen and at 'the three or four only *great* houses of London.' Five years later she declines Disraeli's suggestion that he should spend an autumn in Ireland, as '*any encouragement of his constant love of running about and not keeping at home, or near the Queen, is most earnestly and seriously to be deprecated.*' And in 1870 she wishes him only to go two days to Ascot : and he has to reply : 'I fear, dear Mama, that no year goes round without your giving me a jobation on the subject of racing' ; and to defend himself very firmly and at some length : ending, 'I am always most anxious to meet your wishes, dear Mama, in every respect, and always regret if we are not quite *d'accord*—but as I am past twenty-eight and have some considerable knowledge of the world and society, you will, I am sure, at least I trust, allow me to use my own discretion in matters of this kind.' Yet, impatient as she was of his devotion to society, she made no contribution whatever towards the solution of the difficult problem of discovering what is the proper business of a Prince of Wales. To the contributions which he made for himself, the constant travelling, the getting to know everybody of importance at home and abroad, the presiding over all the non-party activities of the nation, she gave at best a lukewarm approval ; and she added none of her own. To a project vaguely entertained by Gladstone and Disraeli of making him a non-political Lord Lieutenant of Ireland she gave a partial consent ; but he did not desire that, and Gladstone in the end agreed with him. But she gave no encouragement to his wish to be attached to different Government offices and see something of their business, and she would not agree to his even seeing despatches except through her. It was to her youngest son, on the pretence of his being her Secretary, and not to the future King, that she accorded

the privilege of a Cabinet key! Her excuse, not altogether an unfounded one, was that many of the people the Prince of Wales lived with were not fit people to be trusted with grave affairs. But he could not but resent such treatment: and it is infinitely to his credit that, according to the report of one who knew him and his mother and all her children well, he never was heard to speak of her, as more favoured children sometimes did, in any language but that of affection and respect.

Of her private tastes and pleasures we get few glimpses. There is an occasional allusion to music, probably the art she understood best. There is an enthusiastic outburst about Landseer at his death, 'a great genius in his day and one of the most popular of English artists . . . he kindly had shown me how to draw stags' heads, and how to draw in chalks, but I never could manage that well'; and there is a characteristic disapproval of the election to the Academy Presidency of Sir Francis Grant, who 'boasts of never having been in Italy or studied the old Masters.' There are meetings, arranged by Lady Augusta Stanley, with Browning ('the poet, a very agreeable man'); Carlyle ('a strange-looking eccentric old Scotchman who holds forth in a drawling melancholy voice, with a broad Scotch accent, upon the utter degeneration of everything'); and other intellectual notabilities. There is a visit to Tennyson ('very peculiar-looking, tall, dark, with a fine head, long black flowing hair and a beard: oddly dressed, but there is no affectation about him'); and there is a quotation from 'In Memoriam' introduced into a letter to a Foreign Secretary. That is almost the only allusion to a book in these volumes: except a letter which shows her distributing over 4000*l.* profit which remained to her from her own book 'Leaves from the Journal of our Life in the Highlands' after she had paid the editor, Mr Helps. And there is another letter written in 1878 in which we find her reading 'Coningsby': 'a very remarkable strange book,' with 'some beautiful sentiments in it and some very striking opinions, a sort of democratic conservatism, but the same large patriotic views he holds now.' The language, however, she finds 'too stilted and unnatural.'

This was just after its author had told her he had been reading 'Midsummer Night's Dream' and could not understand its title as the action takes place on May Day. 'As your Majesty has much poetic taste and reading you might, Madam, in the inspiring silence of the "Glassalt Shiel" muse over this, and explain the mystery.' Like most women (and men) she was not at all insusceptible to flattery. Once and once only her vanity takes a rather contemptible form: she drives in the Park in 1864 and 'every one said that the difference shown, when *I* appeared and when Bertie and Alix drive, was *not* to be described. Naturally for *them* no one stops, or *runs*, as they always did, and *do* doubly now, for me.' But that is a solitary piece of pettiness. One of the greatest proofs of her magnanimity is the affection she always felt for, and always won from, the fascinating and beautiful Princess of Wales of whose popularity she might so easily have been jealous. But goodness always attracts goodness and, different as the two women were, they were both sincerely and unaffectedly good. The Queen's faults were of a very innocent order. She was a little self-willed, as what woman would not be who had looked at a throne from her nursery-windows and possessed one before she was out of her teens? She could blind herself, as we have seen, to duties she did not like and persuade herself that her retreats to Balmoral caused no inconvenience, had nothing to do with self-indulgence, and were simply indispensable measures of health and prudence! But happy is the woman, or man, who has no worse sins than these to confess. And if she was a little easily managed or deceived by the flatteries of Granville and Disraeli, is that very surprising? We all like to be told that we do our work well. And it must have been very pleasant to be told by Granville (especially as it was partially true) that she had 'saved the country'; or to hear from him of 'your Majesty's remarkable tact and power of what the French call *tour*,' and of his finding Gladstone 'quite under the charm.' Disraeli's flattery, as we have seen, felt no obligation to keep so near the truth as Granville's. He will tell her that what he would really like is to be her Private Secretary: for the sake of that 'he would willingly relinquish his present

exalted post. That is a great honour, but to soothe and assist your Majesty in your Majesty's many troubles and great and inevitable anxieties, and all the constant pressure on your Majesty's heart and brain would not only be an honour: it would be happiness and the greatest!' No wonder she found him 'agreeable and original' in his first Premiership and advanced him to something like intimacy after 1874. He 'prizes nothing more' than the privilege of seeing her: she visits him at Hughenden and sends him primroses (so that the Primrose League is right after all) which he 'likes so much better for being wild: they seem an offering from the fauns and dryads of the woods of Osborne.' What his real feelings about her were it is hard to tell. Probably here as elsewhere he was artist and actor rather than liar: an embellisher of the truth, often till you could hardly recognise it, but not a conscious sayer of the thing that was not. He and his great rival were alike in only one thing, perhaps: neither of them had it in him to state a fact or a feeling as it was. Disraeli buried it in flowers: Gladstone refined it away in subtleties of distinction or twisted it out of recognisable shape by exaggerations of its unimportant and concealments of its important features. Neither of them could at any time or on any subject be quite simple. The telling of plain tales they left to Palmerston in his way or Hartington in his, or even to 'a Mr Smith of Westminster,' whom Disraeli brought into office in 1874; and whom the Queen describes as 'a rich and most respectable, clever man who always maintained that the working classes were not republican.' Disraeli knew his own limitations, and liked both the humour and the utility of being surrounded by such men as Smith and Cross. Of the two unsimplicities there is no doubt which the Queen liked best. It was much more amusing to listen to Disraeli's fantastic orientalisms than to Gladstone's political casuistries. But it is a mistake to suppose that she was always hostile to Gladstone. Perhaps Gladstone, whose reverence for the throne was the profoundest of all the social reverences which were such a marked feature in his temperament, really had a stronger feeling for her than Disraeli. So at least good judges have thought. Certainly she began by



liking him the better of the two, and their relations were only beginning to be really bad at the end of this book. Up to 1876 her language about him is not at all unfriendly; she acknowledges his kindness to her, and made him the offer, not only of Honours, but of a house which she had at her disposal. And no one ever gave him a sounder or really kinder piece of advice than she when, in 1874, she urged him when going out of office not to 'hamper himself by any declarations as to measures of policy'; and told him, on his saying he meant to retire from public life, that that 'was all very well but that for a person in his position to decide this beforehand was almost impossible. Sir Robert Peel had said the same, but if he had lived he could not have carried it out.' How much better she knew him than he knew himself, and how much closer she was to the facts of his position! After all that is her dominant intellectual quality: common sense and an instinct for realities. Both the extravagances of Mayfair and the extravagances of Moody and Sankey seemed to her 'a little mad.' She was of the old '*mens sana in corpore sano*' school, which will not be superseded to-morrow or the day after; and she was well aware that the method of sensationalism and excitement reaps no permanent harvests in any field, whether of pleasure or of religion. Yet her common sense did not keep her from the possession of qualities which common sense alone could never have given her. More perhaps than any of the virtues, humility was the discovery of Christianity. The Horatian common sense, which silly people who have never approached its level affect to despise, is an admirable quality. But it cannot go beyond its own world. It may check conceit but it cannot create humility. Perhaps there is no Christian Church or sect which would find all its demands satisfied by the Queen's religious creed and outlook. Yet the primary business of Christianity is the creation of goodness. And the Queen was a very good woman, and one whose goodness had in it elements which could only have been learnt in a Christian school. The wonder is not that they were learnt, but that they were retained and made part of her life. Has any Sovereign, exposed so very long as she was to the subtle flatteries of a throne, remained so

unaffectedly and genuinely simple, kind, and humble as Queen Victoria? She was not humble for her office: it was not right that she should be. But how humble she is for herself, and how real her feeling was of the equality, transcending all inequalities, which united her with the humblest of her subjects! This book is a book of the Queen, not of the woman. But the woman cannot be wholly concealed, and nearly all we see of her illustrates once more the simplicity, truthfulness, and, above all, the goodness of heart which endeared her to many thousands of her subjects who cared very little, and knew almost nothing, about the political labours with which she filled her life. She was not, and was the last person to claim to be, a genius. But there is something partly akin to genius in the creation of anything. And Queen Victoria certainly began the creation of a kind of Monarchy which neither England, nor any other country, had ever known before.

JOHN BAILEY.

## Art. 2.—WHAT AILS THE ENGINEERING INDUSTRY?

THE march of events works wondrous changes in every industry, but it is very doubtful whether any other trade has suffered such a metamorphosis as has the engineering industry during the past three decades. From the heights of the most prosperous and important of all industries it has apparently fallen to such depths that it has ceased to be a lucrative occupation for lads about to start in the industrial world.

Thirty years ago the mechanic was regarded as, and indeed was, an aristocrat of labour. He considered himself superior to other workers; he seldom associated with plasterers, plumbers, bricklayers, or carpenters, and it was beneath his dignity to be seen in company with an unskilled worker. Parents in every stratum of society, labourers and landlords, bank clerks and builders, shopkeepers and insurance agents, were anxious to apprentice their sons to 'engineering,' proud of the fact that their child was in such a 'nice trade,' and safe in the knowledge—so they thought—that he was being launched into a remunerative career. To-day, were one to question any parent, especially a working engineer, as to what trade he proposed putting his son to, the reply would be emphatic. 'I'll see that he doesn't go into the engineering industry. I'd sooner make him a dustman, road-sweeper, insurance agent, or tallyman.' Thirty years ago it was no easy task to get a lad into 'engineering.' Most firms required a premium of 40% to 50%, 100% being necessary in some cases. Rarely indeed was any one able to enter the trade except as a bound apprentice. As the customary wages for apprentices were: first year 4s. per week, second year 5s., third year 6s., fourth year 8s., fifth year 10s., sixth year 12s. 6d., and the last year 15s., it was no mean sacrifice for many parents to accept.

But they produced mechanics in those days. An apprentice was not, as is so frequently done to-day, placed on one particular job and kept there; he went through the various shops, fitting, turning, erecting, pattern-making, smithy, and drawing office, spending a reasonable time in each, with the result that at the end of his apprenticeship—if the lad was intelligent—he was

a competent journeyman, proficient in every branch of the trade. The British engineer is world famous. In North and South America, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, China, South Africa, and in every country in Europe, men who served their time in Britain, have held, and are holding, responsible positions and, such is the irony of life, making those countries formidable competitors to ours in the world's engineering markets. I am one of the few who, twenty-five years ago, when the motor industry began to make its appearance, managed to steal into 'engineering' without being duly apprenticed, and in the forty odd shops visited during that period, have encountered many of the old-time mechanics, who are never tired of telling tales of those halcyon days when it was possible to throw up a job in the morning and secure employment with another firm in the afternoon. In those days it was customary for mechanics to have Monday 'out,' and I have often been told of foremen being sent to the taverns frequented by the men, imploring them to come to work on an urgent job, even buying more liquid refreshment for them as an inducement. Imagine an employer of to-day, even though it were desirable to do so, sending the foreman with money to buy beer for recalcitrant workmen in order to persuade them to return to work!

The operative engineer is no longer regarded as an aristocrat of labour; rather is he jeered at by other workers. When one takes a long view of the industry as it is to-day this is not surprising, and it is scarcely to be wondered at that parents hesitate at sending their sons to 'engineering.' Even in those rare instances where a lad is legally apprenticed, the chances are that he will be placed in one branch of the trade and there remain during the whole period of his training. Consequently, instead of becoming an engineer in the real sense of the word, he develops into a mere operator, a part maker, a turner, fitter, miller, smith, or pattern-maker, merely a cog in the industrial machine.

There are a few shops left where an apprentice is able to secure an all-round training, but of what earthly use is it to him in this country, except it be on maintenance work? It is perfectly true that there will always be a demand for highly skilled mechanics to make the

jigs, tools, and machines necessary for mass production ; but as the machine develops, simplifying operations and facilitating production, the number of skilled men required diminishes in inverse ratio to the increasing number of partly skilled operators. And the wage offered to a highly skilled mechanic is 3*l.* 5*s.* per week, the minimum being 3*l.* 0*s.* 11*d.* Truly amazing is this fact when one considers the wages paid to road-sweepers and dustmen by West Ham, Poplar, Bethnal Green, and other boroughs ! Has the British engineer any sufficient encouragement to do his best ? Is it any wonder that skilled men migrate to America and the Colonies ? So serious had the menace become that both Sir Allan Smith, the President of the Engineering Employers' Federation, and Mr J. T. Brownlie, the President of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, in asking the Prime Minister to provide work for unemployed engineers, stressed the fact not only that there was a serious dearth of apprentices, but that skilled men were leaving for America in such large numbers that unless this outflow was checked and the industry made more attractive for apprentices, there would be an acute scarcity of mechanics.

It must not be inferred from this that the British engineer is deteriorating in efficiency or in aptitude for work. Writing some time ago in the 'Manchester Guardian Reconstruction Supplement,' Mr W. L. Hichens, of Messrs Cammell, Lairds, Ltd., said :

'There is a popular impression in this country that the British worker is less efficient than in former days. The engineering industry at any rate affords no justification for such an impression. In badly managed shops, no doubt, there may be idleness ; but under efficient management there is no reason to criticise the industry of the workers, and the output per man will generally be found to be even greater than before the war. The members of the industry are as efficient, as hardworking, and as willing as ever they were.'

More recently, in the 'Evening News' of Nov. 17, Mr Hichens declared :

'It is not my experience that the British workman is deteriorating. In the business I am connected with he is working well and hard, and can challenge comparison with the workers of any other nation in the world. I believe that

## 250 WHAT AILS THE ENGINEERING INDUSTRY?

many of the complaints of inefficiency are the result of bad supervision and organisation.'

Mr P. J. Pybus, the managing director of the English Electrical Company, writing also in the 'Manchester Guardian Supplement,' said :

'Much is written about foreign competition, and the devastating effect of the European exchange, but far too little has been said about the sacrifice which the skilled artisans in engineering have made to meet the new scale of world prices. The patience of the engineering craftsmen whose skill is unequalled anywhere in the world, deserves proper recognition.'

Mr Morris, of Morris, Cowley, Ltd., upon returning from a visit to America recently, publicly announced his conviction that the British mechanic was far superior to his American brother. The question before us, therefore, is—if British mechanics are all that these gentlemen say they are, why is it that, apart from the higher wages paid in the States, they should be leaving the country? One reason will probably be found in the fact that the tendency of British industry is to produce industrial 'cogs.' By industrial cogs I mean that every one is kept on a dead level, no encouragement being offered to the development of initiative and ability, consequently the worker has no interest in his work beyond the pay envelope at the end of the week. The more highly skilled men, finding no outlet for their superior skill on this side, seek pastures more lucrative.

The American employer is wiser than his European counterpart. Should an American worker conceive a more expeditious method of doing a job, or suggest an improvement in design, every facility for trying out the new design or method will be given to him, and, should the venture prove successful, he will be financially rewarded and thought well of by the management. In England, however, he would probably be told that he was not there to think but to work. Recently I suggested to a foreman that if a certain fixture was adapted, the operation would be expedited and made more accurate. I was peremptorily told to go on with the job as it always had been done. A particularly bad case in respect to this came to my notice some time ago.



Until comparatively recently the main bearings of the best types of motor-engines were scraped for bedding-in by hand, the operation usually taking a man three days. A broaching machine was devised by means of which a set of bearings could be bedded-in in half an hour, but the complicated nature of the machine necessitated the supervision of a skilled man. In one of the largest motor factories in this country the broaching machine was operated by a Greek mechanic, who, on his own initiative, so simplified the machine that it could be managed by an unskilled worker. The only thanks the man received for his cleverness was his dismissal in the very week that his modification was proved to be a success. Further comment is superfluous beyond saying that had such a thing occurred, say, in Henry Ford's factory, the man would have been suitably rewarded and given a position affording greater scope for his inventive genius. A friend of mine secured employment in the power-house at the Ford factory in Detroit, U.S.A.; but finding that the heat affected his health, he reported to the management and was at once transferred to another department. Imagine an English employer doing that! The complaining worker would have been told to get out if the place did not suit him. Yet my friend tells me that it is usual for men to be transferred from one department to another should they not appear to be suitable to a given shop. This is a wise plan, and British employers would find it a sound policy to pursue, for the best of workmen sometimes find themselves 'out of key' in certain surroundings.

We hear from all sides that the American workman is far more prosperous than his English brother. Not long ago it was Colonel Willey, who had just returned from a visit to the States, who told us so; and later Mr Arthur Henderson declared that wherever he went during his visit to America he saw prosperity; while my friend at Detroit corroborates the statements. Detroit is a city of motor-cars, nearly every mechanic possesses one. How many British engineers own a car? They can scarcely afford a 'push-bike.' I recently met a railwayman from the States touring Europe for a holiday. In the course of conversation he told me he had been working in America for just three years.

## 252 WHAT AILS THE ENGINEERING INDUSTRY?

Such things speak for themselves. Moreover, it is a remarkable commentary upon British management, that Henry Ford can erect a factory in England, pay his unskilled workers 3*l.* per week, and still make his factory pay handsomely by producing a cheap car that no British manufacturer can compete with.

One noticeable feature in the controversy regarding the present sad state of British engineering is that whilst such representative employers as Mr W. L. Hichens, Mr P. J. Pybus, Mr Morris, and Colonel Willey have nothing but praise for the British worker, and whilst Lord Riddell can affirm his belief in trade unionism—his Lordship stated at a recent conference that a newspaper proprietor who attempted to employ non-union labour would be a madman—employers like Sir Samuel Instone, Sir Charles Allom, and Sir Harold Bowden attach blame for the shrinkage of business to trade unionism and the idle worker. Trade Union leaders, as one would expect, deny that the unions encourage 'ca' canny,' and stoutly proclaim that the vast majority of workers are conscientious and willing. It is about time that frankness was introduced into the discussion.

It is a fact that, generally speaking, the unions do not advocate 'ca' canny,' and that unions and employers usually work well together. Were we to examine the rights and wrongs of the countless disputes which are continually cropping up, it would be found that they have their origin in bad employers or workers, or are the outcome of internecine friction in the unions themselves. The employers have found it better to deal with a body of organised men through an accredited official than to have to attend to a number of independent units. Despite the good intentions of official trade unionism it is an open secret in the workshop that the operation of obsolete rules, no less than the shortsightedness of the management, do cause the workers to 'ca' canny.' Take, for instance, the eternal question of payment by results. Although piecework has been a recognised practice since time immemorial; although the premium bonus system was accepted so far back as 1902, the Amalgamated Engineering Union still strenuously opposes any payment-by-result system being introduced into a shop where time-work has hitherto been the custom. Could

anything be more ridiculous? If I might be permitted to express an opinion, based upon experience of every conceivable system of wage-earning, it would be that I prefer piecework. Nothing is more soul-destroying than the awful monotony of making countless numbers of the same thing day after day. If payment is by the hour the tendency is to 'lag' because the pay is sure regardless of output, and one cannot help 'lagging' at times. On the other hand, when a man is paid only for what he does he has an added interest in the job, which somewhat tends to relieve the monotony and produce better results.

Where payment by results operates the unions insist upon limitation of earnings, and the man who overbooks is severely dealt with. What is this but a form of 'ca' canny'? In fairness to the unions it should be stated that they have some reason for this action. Many employers reduce prices immediately a man earns more than usual, thus penalising the whole shop. In those shops where time-work prevails, the shop steward has a record of the time taken on each job, and the newcomer is informed that he must keep strictly to those times. Some workers are naturally quick and cannot work slowly. Such a man will be called all sorts of uncomplimentary names, and in order to conform to discipline, he idles his time away. I have known of cases where quick workers have had their tools broken or stolen in order to retard them. At one shop I worked in some years ago I was able to do my day's work in two hours, the rest of the day was spent in 'killing time.'

These things do not happen where co-partnership, or any other profit-sharing scheme, operates. The worker is then a shareholder, consequently he not only works conscientiously, but he makes it his business to prevent his shopmates 'slacking.' Production is accelerated and workmanship improves. Unlike the old craftsman of thirty years ago, the modern mechanic takes little pride in his work. 'That's good enough. It's not my job anyway,' is too often the usual workshop comment. Prejudiced opposition to improved machinery on the part of the workers is another source of hindrance to progress. When the first Gisholts, Jones and Lamson's, and Herbert Lathes were put into service the employers

had the greatest difficulty in the world to find operators. Craft-prejudiced mechanics refused to have anything to do with them. They are only 'boy's' machines I have heard many say. As a result the employers were compelled to train unskilled men for the purpose, and now union men are screaming because they experience difficulty in claiming these machines for full-rated men.

There has been no little trouble recently at a certain South London institution. It appears that the members of two separate unions were employed in installing the hot and cold water service, and the members of one union objected to members of the other fixing hot-water pipes. Unable to arrive at an amicable arrangement a strike ensued and work stopped. This little affair cost the authorities some 15,000*l*. In the Dock area demarcation of work is an ever-recurring source of friction and stoppage. The boilermakers claim work which is also claimed by engineers. Engineers and plumbers are continually at one another's throats over the question of pipe fitting. Shipwrights and carpenters fight as to who should fix 'grounds' and 'cants.' Joiners and upholsterers cannot solve the knotty problem of laying linoleum. In America a man is permitted to do any work he is capable of; whereas in England it is a common thing for boilermakers, after completing their 'legitimate' work to boiler doors, to have to wait about until the fitter comes along and does his bit. Although the boilermaker is capable of doing the work, union rules say that none but fitters shall do it. Change of material and improved methods are largely responsible for demarcation disputes, but surely in the interests of British industry, the application of a little common sense should settle these problems once and for all. A drastic revision of union rules and practices is essential.

As I have been frank about the shortcomings of the unions, so will I be equally frank in discussing managerial faults. Any one with the years of workshop experience that I have had must have noticed that however 'comfortable' a shop may be, a feeling of bitter hostility exists between workmen and the management. Prominent trade-union leaders have joined well-known captains of industry in appealing for a better feeling, more harmony, and less distrust between workers and

employers. Highly placed politicians and industrial psychologists have discoursed learnedly and feelingly about the irritating effects of toil, fatigue, and monotony, urging that by the application of psychological methods work would be made more palatable. It would appear that all these estimable gentlemen argue from the standpoint that human beings have a natural aversion to work of any kind, although it is encouraging to note from his speech, at the dinner of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology, that Mr Stanley Baldwin does not share this view.

The assumption that workers take a delight in avoiding work is a fallacy; at least such is my experience. 'I like to be busy. The time passes more quickly and pleasantly,' is a common workshop observation, especially amongst the artisan class, and this truth is not surprising when one remembers that any normally active individual would much rather be usefully employed than engaged in the tiresome task of killing time. But what can one expect when men are in daily fear of 'the sack,' when they receive no appreciation for extra effort, and when they see wasteful administration and obsolete methods. Employers and politicians, trade-union leaders and psychologists, alike seem to miss the salient factor in industry, the desire for continuity of livelihood. It is the fear of the sack that determines the action of the workers. A man does not 'ca' canny' because he likes it; on the contrary, he hates it—it is against his better nature. That some men have an innate hatred of work of any kind under any conditions cannot be disputed; but the great majority of workers will, given reasonable security, do their work conscientiously. The average mechanic, when given a new job, will study the drawing and cudgel his brains in order to devise ways and means of getting through the job as expeditiously as possible. The theory of the class struggle, antagonism of interests, has no meaning for him. He has no politics. All that he is concerned about is to prove himself the master of the material that he is called upon to mould.

The inevitable corollary of this characteristic is an intense hatred of wasteful administration, and such is the order of the day in British industry. Not so very

long ago I was working in a big mass production factory. In my shop there were twenty mechanics, yet the administrative side carried a foreman and assistant foreman, two bonus clerks, and six examiners. In addition, there were departmental managers, foremen, underforemen, ratefixers, bonus clerks, and examiners, plus the big office staff. It is calculated that every producer in this works carries at least one non-producer. Trade Union regulations do not interfere with the administrative side of a business, which is entirely regulated by the employer. What has happened is that, during the war, office staffs were enormously increased in order to cope with the extra work entailed by the demand for munitions; and when the slump came, in 1920, managerial staffs were not reduced in the same proportion as the reduction in the number of workmen. It appears to be a peculiarity of British industry that the position of clerk is usually regarded as a permanency, whilst that of the mechanic is dependent on the state of the trade. It is a noticeable fact that when work falls slack it is not usually the non-producers whose services are dispensed with. Whilst at this shop I saw two men sacked at the usual hour's notice at 10.30 one Monday morning. Slackness was the reason. When this sort of thing happens, is it to be wondered at that the worker, although trying out quick methods of production, prolongs the actual operation? 'Why,' says he, 'should I use my brains and work hard whilst these chaps are walking about doing nothing? As soon as work falls off I shall get the sack.'

Another great fault in management is that most work examiners are precision mad. To ensure interchangeability of parts accuracy is, of course, essential; but, to use a workshop colloquialism, there's a difference between scratching one's head and tearing it to pieces. Accuracy is demanded where it is absolutely unnecessary. I have had threads returned to me because they were five thousandths under size. When one knows that the nuts are screwed down tightly and then pinned to prevent them working loose, such fussiness is absurd and tends to irritate. Moreover, if the viewer has a complex against a man he will reject work for the flimsiest of faults, and nothing is more calculated to make a skilled



man cross than to have to go over his work again in order to satisfy the fussiness of the viewer. I can say from bitter experience that much friction arises from these pinpricks, and production necessarily suffers.

The reiterated complaint of the employers is that business does not pay. Has not Sir Allan Smith said this times out of number? Unfortunately for the employers, employees are now able to get hold of balance sheets, and sometimes catalogues, wherefrom they learn that the margin of profit is by no means moderate and that big engineering firms are still able to pay fair dividends. It is a well-known fact that engineering capital was very well watered during the war. I have before me the spare part catalogue of a British firm of manufacturers whose shop I am familiar with. An article costing at the outside—including material—2*l.* 10*s.* to make, is listed at 18*l.* A spindle costing three shillings to produce is priced at 1*l.* 5*s.* Making all allowances for overhead charges the margin of profit is, to say the least, excessive. The system of management in British works needs revision equally with union rules.

After reading the opinions of various captains of industry as to what is required to resuscitate British engineering, one fears to enter the lists. Being a worker I should probably be accused of bias towards the workers. Perhaps I can best explain my views by describing the line of action I would adopt were I ever fortunate or unfortunate enough—according to the point of view—to become an employer. I would commence by abolishing all irritating restrictions. Should a man be late to work he should not be sent home for the day or be required to hang about for an hour. A reasonable time after schedule would be allowed, after which the minutes late would be recorded against the delinquent, the total being deducted at the week end. Payment by results, no restriction of earnings, and no unnecessary cutting of prices, would be the shop practice. Every man would be encouraged to improve methods and develop initiative. When new ideas proved successful the man would be suitably recompensed and in every way appreciated. A few apprentices would be articulated and given a thorough training. Men would be permitted to smoke all through the day if they wished to, and no

man would be upbraided for stopping work for a few moments to chat to his mates. There would be ten minutes' stoppage morning and afternoon with facilities for making tea. The greatest care would be exercised in selecting foremen and viewers. Irascible, domineering bullies would have no place in my factory. Only the best mechanics with understanding and equable temperaments would be chosen for these positions; men who are able to maintain the friendliest relationship with the men and at the same time command respect, obedience, and confidence. In the best of circumstances, human nature being what it is, men will be found with a complex against other men. Steps would at once be taken to separate such men. If by chance an intelligent ambitious labourer showed aptitude for skilled work and he desired to improve his position, I would consult the men, suggesting that he be given a chance on a probationary basis, the full rate to be paid to him as soon as proficient. On no account would I introduce changes before consulting the men through the shop steward. Nothing inspires confidence so much as consulting men as to changes in management. The shop would be made as comfortable as possible, warm in winter, cool in summer. The floor would be properly swept, dust carried away, and draughts eliminated. It is profitable to look after the health of one's employees.

Finally, I would keep in close personal touch with every man, listen to grievances, remedy them wherever possible, and in every way endeavour to gain and retain confidence and respect. This is best achieved through having confidence in and respect for the men. The cynic will probably laugh and declare that a business run on these lines would not pay. If men were so treated, it will be contended, they would get out of hand and submit outrageous demands. I beg leave to differ. After twenty-five years' close contact with and study of British workmen, I am convinced that if they are treated decently and with confidence they will not abuse it. After all, the worker is entitled to respect and confidence. It is only in this way that distrust will be banished from the workshop and the engineering industry again reach the high level that it occupied thirty years ago.

W. F. WATSON.

## Art. 3.—THE PARTRIDGE.

IN the words of the old legend, *Perdix*, the partridge, does not build his nest in high trees, or take lofty flights, but nestles in the hedges, he being the descendant of that unfortunate youth, his namesake, who, according to some ancient writers, incurring the jealousy of his uncle Dædalus, was hurled by that affectionate relative from the top of a high tower, and only saved from destruction by the intervention of Minerva, who arrested his fate by changing him into a bird. Now, 'mindful of his fall,' he avoids high places, rarely using his wings unless compelled. Many changes have taken place in the world since the age of fable, but the partridge, it would seem, remains much the same. He is still averse to 'high places,' seldom making use of any perch other than the brown earth with which his protective plumage—another token of favour on the part of the wise goddess—assimilates so wonderfully that it is nearly impossible to detect the bird when squatting. Here is a characteristic example.

Not long ago, when rabbit-stalking by the light of a late August sunset, I heard a covey alight no great distance ahead on the other side of the hedgerow which I was following. Welcoming the unusual opportunity of observing the shy birds when upon the ground, I crept to what seemed to be the nearest point, scaled the brambly old bank, and, peeping between two ivy-covered ash stumps, ran a searching eye over the adjoining field. This was a rough pasture, bounded by another wild hedgerow, alongside of which white scuts twinkled here and there as the rabbits hopped. A few straggling furze-bushes relieved the monotony of the coarse, parched-looking herbage, while a liberal sprinkling of mole-hills bore further testimony to the inefficiency of the agriculturist. Some ten yards away a little gorse-stump projected a few inches above the grass, which had been nibbled so close by sheep and rabbits that scarcely a mouse could have moved unseen, but though I scanned the turf in every direction and even had recourse to field-glasses, there was no visible sign of the birds. Puzzled, as one never fails to be, though the case is so

common, I was putting away the glasses prior to moving on, when something about the little projecting stub struck me as peculiar. A keener inspection proved it to be nothing less than the head and neck of an old cock partridge, sitting erect and alert, deeply interested in my movements. At the same moment a brown hump near by, till then ignored as a mole-hill, suddenly developed a wing and a beak wherewith to preen it, but further interesting disclosures were frustrated by the old bird, who, deciding apparently that I was not to be trusted, burst up with a warning *krrr-ck*, and a second later the remainder of a covey—some fifteen in all—were up and whirring away across the field.

From a standard of usefulness the plumage of the partridge leaves nothing to be desired, the only feature which to some extent is unaccountable being the horse-shoe brand on the breast, which usually indicates the male bird. All markings and peculiarities in a wild creature serve some end as a rule, and doubtless this curious frontal adornment has its use in the great purpose of concealment. Incidentally, its presence or absence is not a certain criterion as to sex, for, as Mr Ogilvie Grant first pointed out in the 'Field' many years ago, the same mark in a pronounced form is not uncommon among young females. The plumage of both sexes, as in the case of most game-birds, varies considerably according to locality, and this is equally true of their habits. For example, though strictly, and, in a sense, exclusively ground birds, it is not safe to assert that they never alight in trees or bushes. During exceptionally hard weather it is not unusual to see them perched like woodpigeons along the hedgerows, searching hungrily for berries, and in countries where night prowlers are particularly numerous they are even said to roost above ground, though I cannot personally vouch for this statement.

It is, of course, a common habit of the red-legged partridge to alight in trees, which it will sometimes do when flushed in cover, after the manner of a woodcock, before actually taking to flight, a trick which this species shares with the ruffed grouse, the 'partridge' of America, with whom it has much in common. It is worthy of note that, despite a century and a half of residence in

this island, the red-leg remains distinct, even retaining his nationality. He was first introduced into Suffolk by the joint efforts of Lord Rendlesham and Lord Hertford about the year 1770, after which many subsequent introductions enabled him to establish a firm footing in certain parts of the country, notably in East Anglia, Lincolnshire, and some of the Midland counties. So far he has not penetrated to the North or far West, nor is his coming particularly desired, for, like his countrymen in 1066, he subdues as he goes, and where the red-leg once takes up his abode the native partridge disappears as a matter of course. Indeed, he is accused of waging fratricidal war upon his English relative, even to the extent of destroying the latter's young. Mr Dixon mentions an authenticated case in which an entire brood of common partridge chicks was massacred by one evil-disposed 'Frenchman.'

As compared with his British congener, the red-leg is an impudent bird, eminently pugnacious—though our own partridge is by no means backward in this respect—and somewhat over-ready to assert himself, particularly in spring and autumn, when his far harsher call, not unlike the note of a guinea-fowl, sounds incessantly over the fields. In general habits they differ little, the 'Frenchman' being, perhaps, rather a bird of the coverts, and an even more confirmed pedestrian. He will neither stand to a dog nor take wing until positively compelled, and is the more difficult to flush in consequence. In spite of various assertions to the contrary, either bird can thrive upon almost any soil, and many minor 'differences' claimed from time to time are due to circumstance rather than peculiarity of species. Their respective nests are identical. The eggs, however, have little in common, those of the red bird being much larger and richly sprinkled or blotched with dark rust colour, in striking contrast with the uniform olive-brown clutch of the native bird. A curious anecdote of the French partridge is contained among some unpublished letters of the late Rev. E. T. Daubeny, which recently came into my possession through the courtesy of the gentleman to whom they were written.

'I am,' he writes, 'now examining some five hundred essays from the schools round here, on Natural History, for  
Vol. 246.—No. 488.      s

the Norfolk County Council ; a labour of love upon my part. One boy of twelve relates that his father found a red-legged partridge sitting on sixteen stones. These he removed, and a quantity more were placed by the birds and sat upon. These again were taken away ; and a fresh nest was then made and two stones were put into it.'

Many varieties of the common stock occur over the greater part of the civilised world, but with the Briton's insular prejudice I must confess to a marked preference for the species indigenous to the Homeland. There is no bird quite like him, which is perhaps the secret of his wide popularity. The pheasant may be more regal, the red grouse more resplendent, yet neither has quite the same appeal as the 'bonny brown bird' who is so essentially a feature of our British countryside. Many of our national characteristics are apparent in the partridge. He is so sturdy, so independent, and it speaks well for his tenacity that up to a certain point he has contrived to hold his own under changing conditions, which have proved fatal to his mightier, and in many respects more favoured, congeners. Gilbert White, describing the royal Forest of Wolmer, wrote as follows :

'Partridges in vast plenty are bred in good seasons on the verge of the Forest, into which they love to make excursions, but there was a nobler species of game now extinct, which I have heard old people say abounded much before shooting flying became so common, and that was the heath-cock, black-game, or grouse.'

That was true, no doubt, of Wolmer Forest in the 18th century, and it applies equally to the greater part of England to-day. Almost everywhere it is the same story. The 'nobler species,' the blackcock, and, in many districts, even the wild pheasant, has passed, or is making its last stand against hopeless odds. Yet the partridge somehow holds on. The famous 'roll-call' which the most indifferent sportsman cannot hear without a quickening of the pulse still sounds across the open fields and downs as it did when every covert teemed with game. True, the birds no longer occur 'in vast plenty,' but they are here, nor need one fear their extinction in the immediate future.



Even so, in the West-Country the partridge has had a hard fight for existence, and there was a period when sportsmen despaired for the race. The causes were numerous, though the breaking up of so many old estates was mainly responsible. Speaking generally, the new lord of the soil takes few measures to *keep* his game. A partridge, he considers, is there to be shot, and shot it is without a thought for next season's stock. On a farm near my home last season a covey of fourteen was wiped out by the occupier with four shots—significant figures in more ways than one. He killed six of them with one cartridge when they were upon the ground, feeding, and four more with the second barrel by firing into the 'brown' of the remaining birds as they rose. The man himself told the story without shame or reserve, despite the fact that he had not considered it necessary to take out a game licence. Another, also unlicensed, and anxious to steal a march on his neighbours, 'did his bit' a week in advance of the prescribed date.

Little wonder, therefore, that partridges become scarce in some localities, or that sportsmen are crying out for more adequate protection. Too much game, they say, is killed nowadays by uncertificated persons, and there is reason in the complaint. The rights of landlord or tenant have nothing to do with it. It is merely a question as to whether the existing law of the country is to be observed or flouted. Game, moreover, is a limited quantity. The right to shoot it has always been regarded as a royal privilege, or source of revenue to the State, and they who purchase the privilege naturally expect to enjoy it. One does not grudge any man his fair share of sport, or the sport to which he is entitled. At the same time some consideration is due to law-abiders, and the present non-operation of the Game Acts is anything but fair on men who shoot legitimately.

One measure which might serve to strengthen the status of the partridge in this island, and which doubtless will become necessary sooner or later, is some further curtailment of the 'open' season. This in former days did not cease until Feb. 12. It would serve the purpose better, however, to apply any fresh restriction at the beginning rather than at the end of the season. Many

experts even now consider the historic First a trifle too early, and in backward seasons one is inclined to endorse that opinion. Late broods are very 'green' during the first week of September, and stand but a slight chance. Strictly speaking, they show far better sport towards the close of the month, and later on, as we all know, they are well able to take care of themselves. As a rule, they are at their wildest through late October and November, but quiet down considerably early in the New Year, just before pairing time. During hard weather, again, they lie close. Snow has a stupefying effect upon them, and at such times they may be approached without difficulty. There is little glory attached to their circumvention then, however, as the poor birds become so weak and emaciated that one scarcely feels justified in shooting them.

The best cover for partridges in winter is largely a matter of opinion. Root fields they must frequent for food, but I do not think that they care to lie there in wet weather, unless the leaves are sufficiently widespread to afford them shelter. It is incorrect, by the way, to assume that they belong exclusively to arable land. They can exist perfectly well in a grass country, and were more or less plentiful upon Dartmoor within comparatively recent years. Indeed, they like rough country rather than otherwise, being, above all, partial to open, scrubby slopes warmed by the sun. Holding cover they must have, however, and when this is lacking, some preservers advocate the sowing of autumn vetches here and there or other inexpensive crops to keep the birds upon one's land. In my opinion, however, a far more effective plan is to leave, when practicable, small patches of standing corn, of any size, from a few square rods to an acre or so. Such spots, fulfilling all their requirements, will hold birds, both pheasants and partridges, when all other cover fails. In almost every large field, except upon first-class land, there are inferior patches, thin or weedy strips, or spots beaten down by wind or rain, which can be reserved for this purpose at little cost.

There can be no doubt that partridges generally have become much wilder of late years. One has only to hear old sportsmen talk, or to read about partridge shooting

in bygone days, to be assured of this. Various reasons have been assigned, but, after all is said and done, the circumstance most likely is merely due to the wholesale persecution to which the birds have been subjected within the past half-century. So many people are after the partridge nowadays, that his access of wildness is scarcely matter for wonder. Rather would it be remarkable were the reverse the case, but however that may be, the fact remains, and it is hard to reconcile the partridge as we know him with the 'simple' bird so easily deceived or beguiled with 'any device whatever,' of whom Osbaldistone wrote somewhat contemptuously in 1792. In those days, apparently, the difficulty was to avoid the risk of treading upon the birds before they got up in one's face, whereas to-day, it is only necessary to thrust a cautious foot round a gatepost, to spring any covey within a couple of hundred yards.

Yet, for all his elusiveness, there is something 'simple,' or shall we say honest, about the partridge. His strategy is entirely of the straightforward kind, and in the case of the wildest covey, it is usually nothing more than a question of wearing the birds down. Repeated flushing soon tires them, and as often as not, after taking wing once or twice, they hide, and become as reluctant to rise as woodcocks. When space is limited, and birds prove exceptionally wild, it may be necessary to 'break,' or scatter, the covey before any conspicuous success can be achieved. This is not always easy, but it can sometimes be done by heading the birds from their course, or by firing in front of them if it can be done with safety. Shooting at the leading birds sometimes effects this end, *saute qui peut* becoming the order of the moment. When a covey is once broken, careful marking is all that is required, and the birds, scattered about singly, or in twos and threes, may be picked up without difficulty. Single birds, for some curious reason, almost invariably squat close. They appear to lose both their finesse and the resolution that numbers impart, and fall back upon the primitive instinct to hide, falling easy victims in consequence.

Persistent following soon demoralises partridges. They become panic-stricken, take shorter flights, and stragglers diverge from the main body, which eventually

disperses as a last resource. For this sort of thing, however, almost unlimited boundaries are necessary. Also it involves a great deal of leg-work, and is therefore unpopular among modern sportsmen. Again, the services of a first-rate marker are positively essential, otherwise coveys have a curious way of disappearing. Marking is an acquired art, for birds seldom lie exactly where the novice or the amateur expects to find them. One frequently takes elaborate pains to surround and beat up a piece of roots or stubble in which a covey is supposed to have alighted, only to find the birds gone. Sometimes they have really gone—taken wing afresh while those who should have seen them are getting into position, but, more often than not, they were never there. A covey, swooping low over a hedgerow or patch of cover, often appears to be in the act of alighting, whereas in reality it may fly on, skimming low, another quarter of a mile. Also the moment they break view, partridges, like grouse, have the trick of swerving from their course, and taking an entirely different line from that which one might reasonably have expected them to take. That is where good markers, posted at convenient points, do invaluable service. It is well, however, to know their whereabouts. I remember well the case of one man, unsurpassed at the work, but in this instance a trifle over-keen, who, having located a covey well in the track of the guns, shifted his position without warning, and, creeping ahead, established himself in a blind hedge at the top of the field over which the birds had a disconcerting way of vanishing. The result was disastrous—to himself. The covey rose within forty yards of him, and, keeping low, headed straight for his hiding-place. The nearest gun, unaware of his presence, discharged both barrels, of which the somewhat too clever marker got full benefit. In a word, he received a liberal skinful of No. 6, some of which he carries to this day.

Another device by which partridges may be circumvented late in the season is the simple, but perhaps somewhat cruel, 'kite trick.' There is a form of string kite—a Japanese invention, I believe—which when flown bears a striking resemblance to a soaring buzzard. It is very easily manipulated, and when one or more coveys are marked down in a large field, it is only necessary to

get to windward of them and loose the contrivance. A minute or two suffices for this purpose, and with the mock bird of prey once aloft and well over the field, there is no fear of the partridges rising. On the contrary, they will squat like stones, making themselves as far as possible identical with the earth, and so remaining until the guns are almost upon them, when they spring into motion and flash away with inconceivable rapidity, keeping so low that they scarcely appear to clear the stubble, and quick-eyed must be the marksman who would arrest their flight. Should the field happen to be a particularly large one, the chances are that they alight again before quitting it, and if a fence or other cover intervenes, they make no effort to clear the obstacle, but, rather, avail themselves of its shelter.

If they are lying in roots, long stubble, or vetches, when the kite is flown, as likely as not one will be unable to flush them. Then they merely run to the nearest hedgerow from which nothing will dislodge them. They dart in and out like sparrows, and that is where the unfairness of the proceeding comes in, as a couple of efficient guns can soon snap off the entire number. Even when ordinary humaneness and due consideration for next year's stock is shown, however, one hesitates to recommend the practice, for if put to anything approaching frequent use, there is no surer way of driving partridges off one's land. Once in a while it is all very well, if an insufficient toll has been taken of a big supply of birds, and all other methods fail, but in any case it is not advisable to do it too near pairing-time. The latter part of December, or, at latest, the first week in January, should be the limit, for even when carried out in the most judicious manner possible, the terror of the experience is such that survivors are more than likely to shun the neighbourhood for many weeks to come. It should, moreover, be a cast-iron rule never to try it more than once in a season, or, should the first experiment for any reason prove a failure, only repeat it after a liberal interval has elapsed.

I have already remarked that there are men who consider the 'glorious First' a trifle early, but strong indeed must be the scruples that enable any sportsman to resist the call of 'sweet September,' and possibly the

conditions under which early shooting is carried out constitute a large part of its charm. There is no season that can compare with those crisp, brilliant days that almost invariably accompany the 'hunter's moon,' when beeches are reddening and the spindle berries flame from hedgerow and coppice. It is the month of months and few can resist its magic. Every man has his own idea of sport, and what constitutes 'good' partridge shooting. Many prefer the conventional drive, but give me good setter or pointer work. 'Shooting without a dog,' wrote Mr Hesketh Prichard, 'is like an egg without salt, an insipid business,' and I, for one, am entirely of his opinion. That is the worst of driving. There is no room for the dog, a retriever or spaniel well to heel being all that is required. To my mind, shooting over a good setter early or late in the season comes as near the ideal thing as could well be desired, and in no field of sport is there better scope for that perfect understanding between man and his canine ally, which is the delight of all dog-lovers.

The trick of setting or pointing is a remarkable instinct, and one frequently wonders how it was first acquired. Its origin is the harder to trace from the fact that, so far as one can see, the practice has no parallel in the wild. Wolves are natural retrievers, and will carry oddments for miles, with no other apparent motive than amusement. Foxes are natural markers, but where is Nature's pointer? He does not exist, for the simple reason that the trick serves no purpose from the animal's point of view.

The most remarkable setter I ever knew was a mongrel, with a strain of the spaniel somewhere in his make-up. This imparted a tendency to point a rabbit as readily as a bird—a distinctly inconvenient habit at times. If he winded a sitting rabbit in heavy cover nothing would shift him until the rabbit was 'hopped,' and as often as not it was a case of going in to find him or leaving him behind. For keenness of nose he was unrivalled. Another famous dog, for whom I can speak only from hearsay, having never witnessed his prowess, was 'Old Bang,' the property of a sporting farmer who had many tales to tell of his favourite's achievements. Upon one notable occasion he was returning from work



at dusk, accompanied by one of his employees, when the call-note of crouching partridges sounded ahead, and they had not proceeded far before the old dog, who was in attendance as a matter of course, drew to a point. The farmer at first contented himself with bemoaning his luck in having no gun, but, as the birds did not rise and the old dog still stood like a statue, a bright idea occurred to him, and, remaining himself to hold the fort, he sent his companion home for gun and cartridges. This, however, proved a lengthy proceeding, and as time passed and the light rapidly failed, he began to despair of getting a shot. The partridges, meanwhile, had become fully alive to the situation. They displayed a tendency to rise, as was evident from the dog's frequent 'breakings' forward, and nothing but his wonderful steadiness kept them from taking wing. To cut a long story short, he held them for upwards of half an hour, until the gun at length arrived, when his master—more by good fortune than anything else, as it was nearly dark—secured his right and left.

It is a curious thing that even at night, when partridges are particularly wide awake, and for ever on the watch against their arch-enemy, the fox, and ready to take flight at his first approach, they will none the less stand to a dog for an indefinite period. The old-fashioned night poacher—now almost a forgotten quantity—was only too well aware of this, and turned the knowledge to ingenious if unscrupulous account. It was his favourite dodge to secure the services of some steady old setter or pointer, to whose collar a lantern was attached, so that the dog's movements could be followed even in pitch darkness. When the light became motionless, those in attendance knew that the game was located. The fatal net was silently and expeditiously spread, and so one more covey found its way to the poulterer.

Possibly the setter is not the most attractive of dogs. He lacks both the charm of the Labrador, and many of the Cocker spaniel's companionable qualities. Neither can he be described as an all-round dog. He can rarely be brought to retrieve—so far, at least, as my own experience goes—and he possesses the decided disadvantage of being a notorious sheep-worrier. Sport, however, makes strong friendship between man and dog, even as

between man and man, and the now almost too common red setter has figured in some of the most remarkable attachments of this kind with which I have become acquainted. A case in point was that of a dog just mentioned who held the birds while his master waited for gun and cartridges. He was literally his owner's last possession. The good man, so the story goes, died in the direst poverty, having parted with everything else that could be converted into the wherewithal to live, his case somewhat resembling that of Sir Percy Fitzpatrick's 'old mad Blake,' who 'moved on, and took his dogs with him,' his last act the shooting of a brace of partridges for a friend in hospital.

In this country partridges have comparatively few natural enemies. Clutches of eggs and very young birds have most to fear from crows and rats, while there is always danger from prowling foxes. The alarm call of an old bird after nightfall is a tolerably certain indication that a fox, or possibly a poaching cat, is on the war-path. The note of a partridge is capable of more than one interpretation, and conveys a world of meaning to a comprehending ear. In its general effect it curiously resembles the bird's old legendary name, *perr-r-dix*, *perr-r-dix*, being as realistic a rendering of the call as is possible upon paper. It has many variations, however, to distinguish which a sympathetic as well as a discriminating ear is necessary. It may be a challenge, a note of warning or alarm, but most frequently, I think, it takes the form of a rally-call, and there is at times something in it which goes to the heart with an accusing stab, when, returning at nightfall over the fields after a successful day, there sounds through the dusk the distressed and repeated calling of survivors, trying in vain to reunite the sadly depleted coveys. One is reminded of Mr Long's charming story, 'The Partridge's Roll-call,' in which he describes his own sensations when, in the twilight of a New Brunswick forest, he watched an old ruffled grouse calling for the birds who were at that moment stowed away in his shooting-coat pocket.

Partridges are great runners, and a prettier sight than a covey under full headway could scarcely be desired. They travel, like guinea-fowls, in Indian file, with wings slightly raised, uttering a little crooning note

which is very difficult to locate when they are running under cover. They appear to glide or to trickle along rather than to run, and from a little distance an approaching covey looks curiously like a long brown snake. Occasionally in the hush of a Midsummer sunrise one meets these quaint little processions in places where nobody would dream of seeing them, and in this connexion I first became aware of a peculiar habit of partridges about which very little has been written.

They are very fond of dust-baths, and to gratify this fancy they at times display a boldness which would astonish many naturalists. As a rule they can find plenty of suitable places in dry banks or hedgerows, and if one happens to know of a sandy hillock anywhere on a good partridge beat, at least one covey is tolerably certain to be there on almost any fine autumn morning. In certain seasons, however, when wild growth is unusually prolific, or when sheep and rabbits who usually keep such places open fail to do their part, the birds are compelled to seek their requirements farther afield, with the result that the early wayfarer, trudging along some quiet country road during that first still bright hour after sunrise, is more than slightly surprised to come upon a covey 'sunning itself by the roadside.'

And they can even do better. Looking out from the verandah about five o'clock one August morning, I was amazed to see a long string of partridges marching down the drive, heading apparently for the front door as though to call. On this occasion I spoiled the show by inadvertently disclosing my presence, and was entirely at a loss to account for the proceeding until a few mornings later, when looking out by chance about the same time, I scared them up from a large flower-bed in the centre of the lawn, where they had been enjoying a glorious bath to the detriment of sundry sweet-williams and carnations. Needless to say, they were more than welcome guests, and I am glad to be able to add that, to my knowledge, no shot was ever fired at that particular covey.

DOUGLAS GORDON.

## Art. 4.—NEWMAN IN FETTERS.

ONCE in the Church of Rome, Newman yielded himself absolutely to his new masters. To obey became his glory, and Wiseman could say that a more docile convert had never been received. In the year 1846 he went to Rome to be told at the fountain-head of authority what he was to do. Despite his notable work at Oxford, he feels that his powers have not yet found their full scope. 'I have not yet been done justice to,' he writes, '... I have never been brought out prominently.'\* But he appears to have believed that, with the burden of responsibility off his own shoulders and the authority of an infallible Church behind him, a great way of service would be opened to him, adequate to his talents. How vain was this hope, we can easily see. Newman was born to lead and, even more than other men, needed elbow-room. If he had not done his full work in the comparative freedom of the Church of England, he certainly would not in a communion where he must keep his eye nervously upon authority. But as yet this was hidden from him: it took him twenty years before the bitter fact was burnt into his mind. In 1846 he is still in the 'honeymoon period' of his new life and talks hopefully of his prospects. At Rome, however, he received an earnest of what was to follow. Here the finest intellect in Europe is put to school again, and attends daily lectures along with ignorant youths; at which we are not surprised to learn that he was tried. Next he displeased the Pope by a funeral sermon, which he unwillingly consented to preach; and he was (not indignant but) 'terribly frightened' at the idea of his University sermons being brought before the Index. Meanwhile long negotiations were carried on concerning his future. His own idea was to be head of a theological school where he could train the minds of young men, but this did not commend itself to the powers. Various other plans were proposed, which Newman discusses in letters with an anxious minuteness ('almost tiresomely fussy' is Ward's phrase) that is of itself a mark of a certain unhealthiness of mind. At

---

\* Ward, i, 173.

length, however, it was agreed that he was to found a new house of Oratorians, and he accordingly settled himself at Birmingham. There for more than forty years he lived, doing much useful work that any other could have done, keeping accounts, getting up Latin plays, writing letters, building up a library, encouraging the music, but finding little scope for those strong powers which were peculiar to himself.

It is true that the Roman authorities were flattered and gratified at their capture. It was a fine thing to have upon their side a man whose fame was ringing over England, and in a vague way they would have liked to make use of his talents. But they were small and short-sighted men and could not understand one whose nature demanded liberty. If such a man were once to let himself go, there was no saying what he might do. True, he was obedient, but something of the old Adam might still be rank within him : so strong a character and unconventional a mind, if once roused, might even break up a Church. And so, although the English Bishops offered him several pieces of work, they were never easy with him ; there was in reality a deep gulf fixed between him and them.

For five or six years Newman lived quietly at Edgbaston, doing little outside work beyond delivering two courses of controversial lectures, brilliant indeed, but not solid or constructive. In 1851, however, he was invited by Archbishop Cullen to become first Rector of the new Roman Catholic University of Dublin. He hesitated, a state of mind that became more and more common with him. He was attracted by the chance of training young men, and he was not without hope that the work might turn into a second Oxford Movement ; but still he had grave doubts and misgivings, and it would seem that at bottom his judgment was against the scheme. The matter was decided for him by his theory of obedience. The Pope commended the plan, and Newman dreaded to show 'little faith' by refusing. 'In the midst of our difficulties,' he said, 'I have one ground of hope, just one stay. . . . It is the decision of the Holy See ; St Peter has spoken, it is he who has enjoined that which seems to us so unpromising. . . . All who take part with the Apostle are on the winning

side.\* It was not long before he began to find his error. Before six months were out, he was talking of himself as 'harnessed to the work as a horse to a cart.' He was a fish out of water. The mass of the Irish cared nothing for the University. The Bishops, indeed, had decided officially for it, but their idea of a University was by no means the same as Newman's. Newman, while making Christianity the ground of the whole, yet desired to give the utmost freedom to the sciences, and he believed that in the long run truth would prevail over error. He dreaded lest the University should be 'priest-ridden,' and was anxious to give the laity their full share in the management and the teaching. The Bishops, however, were accustomed, as Newman complained, to treat the laity 'like good little boys,' and were unwilling to trust them now. They also 'regarded every intellectual man as being on the road to perdition,'† and desired a University that was little more than a seminary, turning out pious and narrow Churchmen. Nor was their Rector even treated with courtesy. 'Cullen,' wrote Newman, 'has treated me from the first like a scrub, and you will see he will never do otherwise.' He was not installed in his office for two years and a half; his letters were unanswered, his requests disregarded, his time wasted; officials of the University were appointed over his head and against his express wishes; he was promised a Bishopric to give him status, but the promise was withdrawn without a word. He had a constant sense, said a friend, of being 'in a hornet's nest.' Even before his installation as Rector he had concluded that the University was doomed, but he laboured on conscientiously for three or four years more. His own lectures on the nature of a University and the relation therein of Religion to Philosophy, Literature, and Science are extremely able and contain some of his best work; yet here too he was not properly appreciated, and one of his lectures on Science was considered too daring to be delivered. A kind of indifference takes hold of him, though he often talks hopefully. 'I am working very hard,' he wrote in 1857, 'but I take as little (natural or human) interest in it as I do in the cotton plantations

\* I, 313.

† I, 355.



of India. I have never doubted a moment of our success. I am *quite satisfied* with our progress. . . . The notion of disappointment, the very shade of despondency does not come on me.\* He now did a very strange and somewhat questionable thing. In order to stir up the defenders, he wrote anonymously 'a very bitter letter' to a journal, attacking the University. One of his colleagues, ignorant of the authorship, replied, and in the ensuing correspondence Newman found, to his disgust, that he was completely defeating his own side.† He tried to make it up to the University by writing leading articles in its defence, but the incident shows clearly that he had got into a false position, and was doing a work in which he had no real belief. At last, being recalled by his Birmingham brethren, he had an excuse to resign. But, as Ward says, these years in Dublin did much to break his spirit; his glowing hopes faded, and a sadness, even a sourness, came on him. Yet he himself contributed to his own undoing: he did not see that if he were ever to be at the beck and call of others there was no hope for him, that he must at all costs gain his freedom and take his own line. Even in his farewell lecture at Dublin, when his own failure was now manifest, he repeats the fatal advice which was costing him so dear: 'Trust the Church of God implicitly, even when your natural judgment would take a different course from hers.' He himself had just trusted her and burnt himself badly in the fire.

But a fresh call came to him at once. In August 1857 the Bishops invited him to edit the new translation of the Bible. At heart he was unwilling to accept, for he was thinking of writing a book on Faith and Reason; but he obeyed his superiors and began to collect translators. For his own part he designed to write an Introduction to the new version, a *magnum opus*, dealing with the philosophy of Christianity. He begins with enthusiasm, and has prepared the first draft, when the whole scheme falls to the ground. The Bishops give him no support, and it becomes evident that they have no real interest in the work and no confidence in their editor. Newman is deeply hurt, but without a word he

\* I, 373.

† I, 383.

acquiesces and orders his translators to stop, having wasted over a year and lost the better part of 100%. The draft of his introduction he preserved for twenty years and then destroyed; he had not the heart to complete and publish it on his own account; the desire to lean on authority was sapping his initiative and vigour.

Meanwhile, however, there was trouble brewing over a magazine named the 'Rambler,' the organ of a group of Liberal Catholics who were deeply disgusted at the narrow obscurantism of the rulers of the Church. These men, among whom were Simpson and Acton, spoke their minds freely, and gave great offence not only to the ignorant but to the bench of Bishops as well. Newman himself tried somewhat feebly to steer a middle course. He strongly sympathised with the general aims of the Liberals; he called the 'Rambler' 'invaluable,' and denounced in private the ignorance, tyranny, and presumption of its opponents. Yet he was ever hampered by his dread of authority, and he set himself not very successfully to smooth things over and to persuade the 'Rambler' writers to abate their indignation and to moderate their tone.

'I assure you,' he writes to Simpson, the editor, 'that the principal person [Wiseman], who has unfairly used you and whose wishes I have been executing in my negotiation with you, has been personally unkind to me by word and deed. . . . But depend upon it, no advice is better than that of the holy Apostle: If our enemy hungers, to feed him, and to leave our cause simply in the hands of the good God. He will plead our cause for us in His own way.'\*

At length, however, the irritation of the Bishops grew so intense, that they proposed formally to condemn the offending magazine. Newman earnestly desired to stave off such a disaster; and in March 1859, at the request of Wiseman and his own Bishop Ullathorne, he undertook to edit it himself, on condition that it was not openly censured. Here again he was in two minds: sometimes he talks of the editorship as 'a most bitter penance,' at others he appears to be in spirits at the chance of doing important work. He hoped to treat the urgent religious

---

\* I. 488.

questions of the day on sounder and broader lines, giving a moderate Liberal tone to the Review, and thus to get the patient to swallow by degrees the medicine that Simpson and Acton had tried, as it were, to thrust down his throat. But his expectation was vain. His very first number gave offence, and Ullathorne suggested that he should resign. It was a great blow to Newman, but he hastened to comply.

'It is impossible,' he wrote, 'with the principles and feelings on which I have acted all through life, that I could have acted otherwise. I never have resisted, nor can resist the voice of a lawful superior speaking in his own province. . . . It may be God's will it should be done a hundred years later. . . . When I am gone it will be seen perhaps that persons stopped me from doing a *work* which I *might* have done. God overrules all things.'\*

Worse, however, was to follow; an article of his own in his second and last number was delated to Rome as heretical, and although it was finally acquitted, yet the Pope was pained and sent a private rebuke, and confidence in Newman was shaken. For a year or two longer the 'Rambler' went on, and was then succeeded by the 'Home and Foreign Review.' Newman continued his half-support of the Liberals. He sees that some such work as theirs is urgently necessary for the times and he is indignant with their adversaries, but he will risk nothing for them. As soon as there is a question of offence being given or of authority interposing, he always draws in his horns and counsels submission. 'If they do not,' he writes, 'allow the "Rambler" to speak against the Temporal Power, they seem to me tyrannical, but they have the right to disallow it. . . . *They* have the responsibility and to them we must leave it.'† Acton at times was thoroughly angry at what he considered the poor spirit of his ally, and the orthodox side was also grievously offended. Newman became so isolated and even unpopular, that Burns the publisher considered it a disadvantage to the sale to associate him with any review. When, in October 1862, the 'Home and Foreign' was censured, Newman, without even reading

---

\* I, 496-500.

† I, 524.

the condemned articles, made haste to write a letter of complete submission to his Bishop, throwing over the Review and saying that he 'concurred with all his heart' in the censure; and he took care to tell this to his friends. Yet he was deeply depressed, and a few days afterwards, being troubled by the thought that Simpson had perhaps not been fairly treated, he wrote a second letter to explain that he had given no opinion on the justice of the censure, but simply desired to yield to authority. 'No good ever came,' he writes, 'of resisting the appointed pastors of the flock. It is they who are answerable if the Church suffers. I will never be so rash as not to leave them their responsibility.'\* At length a still stronger claim was made on his obedience. In December 1863, the Liberals of Germany were condemned in a Papal Brief. Newman was much grieved. 'I don't think,' he wrote, 'that active and honest minds can remain content under a dull tyranny';† but he submits again, and concludes that he himself is now shut up from writing on the problems raised by science. Sadly he determines to leave all such thorny questions alone.

These years were some of the saddest of his life. He was now, as Wiseman put it, 'on the shelf,' and his friends wondered at his silence and inactivity. He lived more and more in the past, in the distant days when he had been a great man at Oxford. He complains that he is misunderstood, backbitten, scorned; that he always fails in spite of his desire to please his masters; that there is now no private judgment or freedom; that he has to fight with a chain on his arm. The clouds break for a time in 1864, when he publishes his 'Apologia.' This brings him again before the minds of his countrymen and gives him a new fame; it also leads to a renewal of some of his old Anglican friendships. But it does not appease the deep need of his soul, or open to him that great work which he longed to do; and he sinks back into despondency. He talks indeed of disregarding Propaganda and following up his success by further exertions on his own account; but in the end he does nothing. He has no heart even to write a book. 'Let

---

\* I, 544-552.

† I, 566.

well alone,' he says; 'do not hazard by any fresh act the loss of [your new honour]. . . . Enjoy the *otium cum dignitate*.\* When in 1866 a friend urges him to write, he excuses himself.

'It is hard to keep from falling, and the fall is great. . . . You may get into hot water before you know where you are. . . . You don't know me when you suppose I "take heed of the motley flock of fools." No, it is authority I fear. Di me terrent et Jupiter hostis. I have had great work to write even what I have written. . . . Why cannot you believe that letter of mine in which I said I did not write more because I was "tired"?'†

There were, however, some in authority who hoped to take advantage of his new reputation; and in August 1864, when some good land in Oxford fell vacant, Ullathorne invited him, as head of the Oratory, to undertake a mission for the benefit of the Roman Catholic undergraduates. The exact plan was uncertain: it might be a Church or a Hall or a College or an Oratory; but whatever it was, it would give Newman an opportunity of bringing his influence to bear in a University city. Newman accepts, though with his usual misgivings and shrinking; he buys the land and prepares to build a church. He hopes to do a work in helping to beat back the rising tide of agnosticism. Hardly, however, has the rumour leaked out, when Manning, Wiseman, W. G. Ward, and their allies, mistrusting Newman's influence in Oxford, set to work to bring Propaganda to their side; and they succeed. Newman protests bitterly in private against the unfair methods used, but he has no chance; and, in December 1864, the English Bishops, inspired by Rome and (so Newman believed) against their own judgment, passed a resolution forbidding Roman Catholics to go to Oxford at all. This killed the Oxford Mission, and one more hope was dashed to the ground.

An excellent example of Newman's state of mind is offered in a letter of March 1865, in which we see on the one hand his uneasy sense of a work to be done, and on the other his extreme passivity and want of initiative.

---

\* II, 44, 203.

† II, 126.

'Of course,' he writes, 'it is a constant source of sadness to me that I have done so little for [God] during a long twenty years, but then I think, and with some comfort, that I have ever tried to do as others told me, and if I have not done more, it has been because I have not been put to do more, or have been stopped when I attempted more. The Cardinal [Wiseman] brought me from Littlemore to Oscott, he sent me to Rome, he stationed me in Birmingham. When the holy father wished me to begin the Dublin Catholic University, I did so at once. When the synod of Oscott gave me to do the new translation of Scripture, I began it without a word. When the Cardinal asked me to interfere in the matter of the "Rambler," I took on myself, to my sore disgust, a great trouble and trial. Lastly, when my bishop *proprio motu* asked me to undertake the Mission of Oxford, I [bought land] and began, as he wished me, to collect money for a church. In all these matters I think (in spite of many incidental mistakes) I should on the whole have done a work, had I been allowed or aided to go on with them, but it has been God's blessed will that I should be stopped. If I could get out of my mind the notion that I could do something and am not doing it, nothing could be happier, more peaceful, or more to my taste than the life I lead.'\*

The next year, however, the Oxford scheme was revived. Despite the frowns of the Bishops, young Roman Catholics were still going to the University, and in April 1866 Ullathorne again invited Newman to undertake the Mission. Newman, who was always attracted to University life and the guardianship of young men, accepted this new call as from above, yet not without grievous lamentations. He writes that it has been forced on him against his will and without his judgment, and that he only goes because he fears to be deaf to a Divine call.

'You can't tell,' he says, 'how very much down I am at the thought of going to Oxford. . . . The notion of getting into hot water is most distasteful to me, now when I wish to be a little quiet. I cannot be in a happier position than I am. . . . The mere publicity is a great trial to me. . . . O dear, dear, how I dread it—but it seems to be the will of God, and I do not know how to draw back.'

By the end of the year formal permission from Rome

---

\* 'Standard,' May 15, 1905.



had been obtained, and Newman issued a circular asking for support. All seemed promising, and at length only three or four weeks remained before he was to take possession. On April 6, 1867, he went for a walk in Birmingham with Neville, whom he was sending that day to Oxford, and he talked joyfully about the prospect. 'Earlier failures do not matter now. I see that I have been reserved by God for this. . . . Such men as Mark Pattison may conceivably be won over. Although I am not young, I feel as full of life and thought as ever I did. It may prove to be the inauguration of a second Oxford Movement.' As they reached home, a blue envelope, sent by the Bishop, was handed to Newman. It contained the news that along with the formal leave to start the Mission a secret instruction had been sent from Rome that Newman himself was not to be allowed to reside at Oxford. On reading it he turned to his companion. 'All is over,' he said, 'I am not allowed to go.' Without a word more he walked away, covering his face with his hands.\*

Alas, alas! How are the mighty fallen! Can this be the man who once led because he must lead, who was formed by nature to command others and refused to be moulded by circumstances? Now he stands like some faithful slave before a capricious master, eager to work, anxious to please, but never knowing when he will meet a blow or a curse or a harsh word. He has learnt to follow rather than to lead, he is nearly always in two minds, he is hesitant instead of venturesome, he knows that he has splendid powers but cannot use them. Even when the truth of God is threatened he has little heart to fight, and earnestly desires to shelter behind authority. More than one visitor to Edgbaston commented on the look of weakness in Newman's face, and the very photographs reveal something of this. The print of Vol. II, p. 80, where he sits and looks up at a younger disciple almost as at a protector, is no fit posture for a man of genius, a commanding spirit, a master mind.† The

\* II, 123-139.

† Cf. Lecky's strange account of Newman in a Swiss hotel in 1866, 'speaking to no one, rarely smiling and on the whole looking very melancholy,' and accompanied by a friend, 'who had a general look of being his keeper, beckoning him with his eyes when to leave the room, and who at

tragedy of Newman's life lies not in his outward circumstances, in the short-sightedness of his fellows, or the rancour of his enemies. A strong man is bound to meet these things, and in truth Newman had less to bear than many others. St Paul was dogged by foes from city to city, was slandered, was beaten, stoned, imprisoned, nearly murdered; his churches were troubled, his work well-nigh undone: but he answered the call of God; he fought his enemies and won. Had he followed Newman's doctrine of submission, he would speedily have been beaten out of the field by the Judaisers, and the untruth would have triumphed. Wesley, again, was denounced by his brethren, inhibited by Bishops, robbed of his preaching turns at Oxford, called a fanatic and a traitor, again and again was attacked by raging mobs: but he surmounted all difficulties; if one way was closed, he found another; he dared not be silent when he had a message to speak. But Newman was his own enemy; he fostered in his bosom a traitorous weakness which rendered him an easy prey to his ill-wishers; he kisses the hand that stabs him; he allows himself to be muzzled. Many harsh words he hurls at his enemies and those who pull the strings of the Papal Court. Insolence, reign of terror, crooked ways, trickery, persecuting spirit, intrigue, tyranny, espionage, cruelty, conspiracy—such in private are his indignant phrases. He applies to them the terrible text of the offence against the little ones and the millstone. He complains that the rule of Rome is arbitrary and military, that a thorough routing out is needed there to kill the red-tapism of the Court and the unreality of the Cardinals and Archbishops, that there is now a great lack of manliness and boldness, that the Church shrinks into itself, narrows the lines of communion and trembles at freedom of thought, that multitudes are carried away by false teaching and no one answers; and for all this he foretells a stern nemesis to come.\* Why, then, did he not stand up, say his say and risk all? He hopes that others will speak out, but why did he not speak himself? No voice was so powerful as his, no influence so far-

tea kept his hat on and read a book, leaving poor Dr Newman very sadly gazing at the bottom of his tea-cup' ('Life of Lecky,' p. 47).

\* I, 560, 566; II, 127, 229, 297, 376, 553.

reaching. But alas, his confidence in himself is gone, his energies are paralysed, and he sits still.

The failure of the Oxford plan ended his hopes of active work as a Roman Catholic. He was now 66, nearly an old man, and he had twenty-one years of failure behind him. The iron had entered into his soul; he had no hope or fear; he only asked to be let alone. Yet the feeling that he had something to say still haunted him, and he cannot bear to go down to the grave without making another effort. At least he can write a book, and by steering clear of burning questions he may escape the censure of authority. The task occupies him from 1866 to 1870. He does it with fear and trembling: he is 'encompassed by a host of ill-wishers'; he is 'fighting *under the lash*, which does not tend to inspire courage and presence of mind'; there will be 'a pack of Catholic critics' down on it; 'every word will be malevolently scrutinised and every expression that can be perverted will be sent to Rome': he even fears the book will be stopped after all his labour.

'Our theological philosophers,' he complains, 'are like the old nurses who wrap the unhappy infant in swaddling bands or boards—put a lot of blankets over him—and shut the windows that not a breath of fresh air may come to his skin, as if he were not healthy enough to bear wind and water in due measure. They move in a groove and will not tolerate any one who does not move in the same.' \*

To guard against attack, he persuades a friendly theologian to act as private censor—an office which the latter seems to find rather trying—and anxiously offers to give up any phrase or argument that he might disapprove, or even to abandon the whole book. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the writing of this book tried him more than any other of his works; but at last it was finished to his own great relief, and although the 'Grammar of Assent' has not had a marked influence on the world's thought, it is a solid and constructive contribution towards a philosophy of religion.

Bitter indeed are Newman's complaints in his diary and more intimate letters about his inactive life. He

---

\* II, 254.

was ever haunted by the feeling of a great work undone and a great mission unfulfilled.

'I have seen,' he writes, 'great wants that had to be supplied among Catholics. . . . My apparent ill-success discourages me much. O my God, I seem to have wasted these years that I have been a Catholic. What I wrote as a Protestant has had far greater power, force, meaning, and success than my Catholic works, and this troubles me a great deal'\* (1860); 'My feeling is I have not yet fulfilled my mission and have work to do. This haunts me'† (1861); 'This morning when I woke, the feeling that I was cumbering the ground came upon me so strongly that I could not get myself to go to my shower-bath. I said, What is the good of living for nothing? . . . I look back on my years at Oxford and Littlemore with tenderness. It was the time when I had a remarkable mission; but how am I changed even in look! . . . It began when I set my face towards Rome. . . . [There are] things which I ought to have been specially suited to do, and have not done, not done any one of them. . . . A certain invisible chain impedes me, or bar stops me, when I attempt to do anything—and the only reason I do not *enjoy* the happiness of being out of the conflict is because I feel to myself I could do so much in it. . . . How can I fight with such a chain on my arm? It is like the Persians driven to fight under the lash. . . . Perhaps I am hiding my talent in a napkin'‡ (1863); 'It has been my cross for years and years that I have gone on *operose nil agendo*'§ (1867); 'What am I doing, what have I been doing for years, but nothing at all? I have wished earnestly to do some good work . . . but again and again plan after plan has crumbled under my hands and come to nought'|| (1869); 'I am doing very little good now, and it would be a great thing if I did something more, to give me a right to live. My conscience so preaches to me continually'¶ (1871); 'For many years I have made attempts to break through the obstacles which have been in my way, but in vain'\*\* (1873); 'I have so depressing a feeling that I have been doing nothing through my long life, and especially that now I am doing nothing at all. . . . It is enough for me to prepare for death, for there is nothing else to do. . . . I have been startled on considering that in the last fifteen years I have only written two books, the "Apologia" and the "Essay on Assent"—of which the former was almost extempore. What

\* I, 577-578.

† I, 607.

‡ I, 582-590.

§ II, 187.

|| II, 254.

¶ II, 332-333.

\*\* II, 328.

have I been doing with my time? . . . Whereas before 1859, I wrote almost a book a year, in the last fifteen I have written between three and four—though such powers of writing as I may have are not less, to say the least, than they were. This is an unpleasant thought—more than unpleasant—What have I been doing?’ \* (1874).

And we are told that from 1875-9 he was troubled by the same thought and that his general gloom and silence were very noticeable. ‘What he had done as a Catholic,’ says Ward, ‘seemed so fragmentary, so incomplete.’ †

It is usual, however, to speak of the change wrought in Newman’s life by the offer of the Cardinal’s Hat in 1879. Certainly he was much pleased, though he talked as if he would have liked to refuse the offer. It was balm to his sore and wounded spirit to be publicly recognised and honoured instead of shunned and mistrusted; the cloud, he said, was lifted from him for ever. But the new dignity could not fetch back his wasted years, or bring into being the great work which he desired. Does such a man as Newman seek empty honour? Achievement he values or even power. No one despised more heartily the baubles and glittering prizes of the world. And so even as Prince of the Church he would at times harp on the old theme and express his regret for lost time. His strong nature was still in chains, though the chains might be of gold.

Now when once we have grasped Newman’s secret, it becomes easy to explain his constant division of mind. He never appears to know what he wants, and is pulled two ways at once; he is hopeful and despondent, eager and hesitating, he is unwilling to put himself forward and yet longs to do some great work; he discusses the pros and cons of things almost *ad infinitum*, and is indeed hardly capable of firmly making up his mind. The truth was, there was a perpetual unrest and conflict in his nature. His real self, bold, strong, and fearless, is ever urging him forward; he feels that he ought to be up and doing; but when it comes to action, he is paralysed by that weaker self which he had allowed to master him. He has sunk into an ecclesiastical theory

\* II, 398-400.

† II, 431.

which effectually shackles him when he desires to move. Thus while he often talks of taking strong action, he does little or nothing in the end. Two more illustrations of this passivity may be given.

In 1865 W. G. Ward published his opinion that Pius IXth's 'Syllabus Errorum' and Encyclical were infallible utterances. Newman strongly disagreed, believing that, unless the statement were contradicted, many would be driven from the Church towards free thought; and he knew from conversation that O'Reilly, a theologian, shared his own view. He proposed, therefore, to write a public letter in opposition to Ward. But when he heard that O'Reilly refused to put his opinion on paper, his love of safety got the better of him, and he would not take the risk of going forward.

'Of course it puts an end to the whole scheme,' he wrote. 'As to my bringing out my views, it is absurd. . . . We must wait for a reaction. But if there are no protests, there will be no reaction. . . . But if I am asked [on the question] *what am I to say?* . . . It is best to wait patiently and not to forestall a crisis, but it is quite certain that *any day* I may be obliged to give an answer. I really do wish I had a distinct opinion given me as my safeguard. . . . Priests all through the country will follow Ward, if he is let alone. . . . I should care nothing for any personal obloquy which might come on me now, *so that I am sure of my ground*. How very hard a man like Father O'Reilly will not at least in confidence speak out!'

This letter shows how far he has travelled. Has it really come to be a 'crisis' for an able man to be asked his opinion? What a change is here!

Secondly, let us consider Newman's attitude towards the Vatican Council of 1870. He was strongly opposed to the Infallibility Definition and detested the methods of its promoters. Though he personally 'on the whole' held that dogma, yet he considered that it was not held by the great Doctors of the Church and that it was no sin to doubt it. He refused to believe that the definition would ever be made; and even if carried, he would think it 'most unfortunate and ill-advised.' The crisis was a 'grave' one, and he inveighed against the tyranny



and cruelty of the Infallibilists. Friends urge him to come out boldly with his views and his own conscience pricks him, but he does nothing.

'I continually ask myself,' he writes in January 1870, 'whether I ought not to make my feelings public; but all I do is to pray those great early doctors of the Church, whose intercession would decide the matter—Augustine and the rest—to avert so great a calamity. If it is God's will that the Pope's Infallibility should be defined, then it is His blessed will to throw back the times and the moments of that triumph He has destined for His kingdom; and I shall feel I have but to bow my head to His adorable, inscrutable Providence.'\*

By chance, however, the above letter, containing his real sentiments and denouncing the other side as an 'aggressive and insolent faction,' got out in the newspapers and made a great stir; and it is a good illustration of his double mind, that when this happened, he was glad that his real views were now known and glad also that he could disclaim responsibility for their publication. He congratulated himself that now he need do nothing more. He sat in his tent and watched his own side being beaten. Yet who can say what he might have done in the conflict? Even as it was, most of the ablest and most learned Bishops were against the definition, and the laity were lukewarm. It is not impossible that the active exertion of so great a man might have turned defeat into victory and hindered what he regarded as a disastrous step. After the decree, Newman was not without hope that the minority would take concerted action, but for himself he hastened to accept it, ruling his conduct (he said) by what was 'safer.'

We have, however, seen that Newman was uneasy under this constant passivity, and he feels it necessary to justify himself. His commonest excuse is that everything is in God's hands and if he himself does nothing, evil will be overruled by supernatural power. He reverses the old proverb and says that 'God works for those who do not work for themselves.'† Thus in 1848, after denouncing an unjust action as 'shameful,' he adds, 'But somehow I think that our Lady and St Philip will take our part if we do not take our own';‡ and other

---

\* II, 288.

† II, 129.

‡ I, 209.

instances of such language have already been met with. Truly he might have applied to himself the scornful words which he used of the Vatican Council, after reading their decrees upon Inspiration: 'The Pope and the Bishops seem to have left everything to the Holy Ghost.' Another excuse is that 'the time may not be propitious' for action, and that by doing a right thing at a wrong time a man may become heretical.\* Or he comforts himself with the quite erroneous idea that the less he does, the more others will do.† Or he makes the strange, and surely unchristian, plea that to rebut a false charge is 'to retort the blame of falsehood on those less able to bear it than I.'‡ Or he pleads—not without truth—that he is 'too proud and indolent'§ to fight, or that he would 'lose his time, peace, and strength and only show a detestable sensitiveness.'|| All these varying and sometimes contradictory excuses bear witness to the deep dissatisfaction of his mind. *Qui s'excuse, s'accuse*. He knows that his present condition is somehow wrong, but he has not probed to the depths of his being nor can he put his finger on the root-cause of his trouble.

We are now also better able to explain those occasional outbursts of anger, and even ferocity, which have somewhat shocked his admirers. Two cases readily occur to the mind. What means the bitter tone of those parts of his reply to Kingsley, which he himself suppressed in later editions of the 'Apologia' and which Hort even called 'horribly unchristian'? Or what are we to say of his incredibly violent words against the Church of England, after he had read in a newspaper the rumour that he was to return to that communion? Usually he speaks of his old Church with respect and even affection; he is unwilling to oppose her and regards her as a bulwark against infidelity; he follows with interest her doings; he is even known to attend her services: but on this occasion he lets himself go with a vengeance.

'I do hereby profess *ex animo* with an absolute internal assent and consent, that Protestantism is the dreariest of possible religions; that the thought of the Anglican services makes me shiver, and the thought of the 39 Articles makes

\* I, 499.

† II, 126.

‡ I, 455.

§ I, 455.

|| II, 129.

me shudder. Return to the Church of England? No! The net is broken and we are delivered. I should be a consummate fool (to use a mild term) if in my old age I left the land flowing with milk and honey for the city of confusion and the house of bondage.\*

In both these cases Newman afterwards put forward an explanation of his tone. He was not, he said, angry in feeling or uncharitable; he spoke thus for the sake of the effect on others; the only way to drive his points home was to use violent language; 'it would not do' to seem tame under Kingsley's charge; he must assume an anger he did not feel.† But this explanation is palpably inadequate to the facts; and even if it were true, it would substitute a graver fault for a lesser: for a spontaneous anger in controversy may be excused, but the playing of a part for effect's sake would be a serious want of candour. The truth was, his fierce words sprang out of the unhealthy state of his mind and the suppression of part of his powers. When a strong man narrows and straitens his nature over a long course of years, when he is reserved instead of outspoken, timid instead of bold, it often happens that when he does give rein to his feelings, he oversteps the bounds; his pent-up nature sweeps him away. This may have been partly the reason; but there was a deeper one still. The words which angered him contained their sting; they were not indeed true, but they were linked in his mind with facts that were extremely disagreeable to reflect upon. Kingsley had said that truth for its own sake was not a virtue to Roman Catholic priests and that Newman admitted it. Newman showed easily that he never had admitted it, but what was it that was happening in his own life? To have strong convictions and to shut them up at the bidding of men, to 'be obliged to trim one's language, to purse up one's mouth, to mince one's words,'‡ to see errors and not to try to set them right, comes dangerously near to an indifference to truth for its own sake. It is difficult to acquit Newman of the charge of caring for the opinion

\* I, 581.

† But elsewhere he states that he wrote against Kingsley 'with the keen feeling which I really had' ('Life of Lord Coleridge,' II, 127).

‡ II, 229.

of the visible Church more than for the truths entrusted to him by God and of allowing the Lord's people to perish for lack of knowledge. His natural love of truth was under a certain constraint, because he was not free. And again, to complain constantly of a wasted life in the Roman Church, to look back regretfully to Oxford, to be forced to fight under the lash, to be in terror of the Papal authorities—what does this mean but that he had made a blunder in entering that Church? But this was a thought which Newman never brought himself to face, though it lurked in the recesses of his mind. To have to confess that the great conversion with which England rang was not a wonderful miracle of grace but a yielding to his own weaker nature would have been very unpalatable; indeed, he could not even contemplate the possibility without a rebellion (in imagination) against authority of which he was now hardly capable. Perish the thought! At all costs this unpleasant rumour must be killed, let those suffer who may.

A few other minor facts may also be mentioned which bear witness to an unsatisfied life. He complains of his lot much more than the facts warrant. 'No one,' he writes, 'has spoken well of me' (1845); 'All through my life I have been plucked' (1859); 'I have had no piece of good news for thirty years. . . . I have never been praised for anything I did but once' (1861): such phrases are common. In a poem of his later life he says that he is ashamed of himself for 'complaining of heaven and earth,' and on the last page of his journal he wrote: 'I am dissatisfied with the whole of this book; it is more or less a complaint from one end to the other; but it represents what has been the real state of my mind.' Yet his troubles should not have been overwhelming; indeed, his mother seems to have been of opinion that his Oxford life was too easy rather than too hard; at any rate he had nothing to meet which a strong man ought not to be able to face with a good heart. Then we observe that he repeatedly laments over his indolence and want of energy; he is often tired; he is unwilling to leave home; he seeks obscurity, forgetting that talents like his must inevitably bring him before the public eye; and though he has no disease, he is at times nervous ('almost absurdly anxious,' says Ward) about his health. We

read also of his 'extraordinary implacability' in later life and his slowness to forgive any who offended him—a fault not uncommon in strong natures that are cramped and penned-in.

Finally, it is noteworthy that in his Roman years Newman wrote and published less than in the much shorter period of his Anglican. Roughly speaking, it may be said that he was in proportion half as prolific or even less. Yet at the time of his secession his powers of writing were just reaching their height, and his later style is far more brilliant and splendid than his earlier. Besides, after 1845 he lived for the most part in retirement, and had ample opportunity for writing, had he been so inclined. Why, then, did he not write more? The answer is that Newman was only a great writer (so to speak) by the way. He did not want to sit down in his chair and write masterpieces; he wanted to be in the thick of things, influencing and leading men, winning to himself spiritual children, seeing at first hand everything that went on. *Then* he could write; for events and persons seemed to call and rouse him; a definite need had to be met, or a definite danger averted. At Oxford he had, with whatever limitations, been in a great position and wielded a great influence; but in Edgbaston, with few direct calls upon his energies and with the dread of authority before his eyes, he seemed to grow cold. T. Mozley, disciple and brother-in-law of Newman, protested in his 'Reminiscences of Oriel' against the idea that had grown up of Newman 'as a mere dialectician and orator,' and to show what he had been in old days he added a strong letter of counsel and rebuke written by his master to himself as a young man. That indeed was the key to Newman's character, the power of leadership; and if that was thwarted, then his other energies also tended to fail. In later life he had little heart even for preaching, and once at least speaks of his dislike of the work. For twenty or thirty years he hardly ever preached away from his own church at Edgbaston; and there he did little more than give a short practical talk extempore on some passage of Scripture.\* He only published two Roman volumes

---

\* So says his colleague, T. Arnold.

of sermons as against ten of his Anglican years. He could not preach for preaching's sake; he could only preach as part of a great work, as subserving the interests of a great mission.

It is, of course, true that Newman often expressed his fervent attachment to the Church of Rome. He talks of his supreme satisfaction and unclouded faith, of his perfect peace and contentment; he says that he has never been visited by a moment's wavering or disappointment.\* But it was not his true self that spoke in these words. To that weaker nature which had grown up in him, there was indeed a peace and comfort in resigning himself to the arms of an infallible Church instead of fighting out his difficulties in the open, there was a contentment in feeling that the issue did not depend upon his own exertions. But it has been abundantly shown in these pages that behind these ardent protestations there lay a strong want of the soul, a deep and unsatisfied longing. And when we remember that Newman, long after he had lost belief in the Dublin University, made the very same protestation that he had not a shade of doubt, despondency, or disappointment, and that nevertheless in a few months he was only too glad to be quit of it, we shall realise that he did not always understand himself or give an accurate account of the workings of his mind. Many of his bitter cries of distress we have already heard; let us hear one more. In his journal of 1859 he complains of his shrinking from sacrifice. 'O rid me,' he prays, 'of this frightful *cowardice*, for this is at the bottom of all my ills. When I was young I was bold, because I was ignorant; now I have lost my boldness because I have advanced in experience.'† All is not well with the man who can write such words; his false theory of the Church was crushing him, but he knew it not.

Froude has compared Newman with Julius Cæsar, and the comparison is sound in regard to temperament. But Cæsar was a heathen, and a bad one at that; his affections degenerated into sensuality and his talents into self-seeking. Among the great Christians can we find no one to whom we may liken him? He is like

---

\* I, 10, 580, 654; II, 526.

† I, 576.



the Apostle of the Gentiles. Paul, too, was intellectual, though doubtless he lacked the wide opportunities and training of Newman; he was a writer of power and distinction, though he cared little for the mere graces of style; he was warm-hearted and won the passionate attachment of his friends; he was sensitive and easily moved, and flashed out in a moment into anger or tears; he had the same understanding of men and ascendancy over them; he could make Felix tremble in his palace, could win the support of the captain on board ship, and touch the heart of the runaway slave in Rome; he had the same intense and ardent nature, the same utter devotion to the Christian religion; he had the same sense of a great mission entrusted to him. But here the contrast begins. Affectionate and sensitive as he was, there was a robust vigour and confidence about St Paul. He is a man of the world, he moves easily everywhere. He goes into synagogues, into kings' courts, into prisons, into market-places, among slaves and artisans and philosophers, among men and women, among Jews and Greeks; and wherever he goes, he is in the front of things. Above all, in doing his Christian work he is not afraid to claim a direct spiritual authority of his own. Though he is the least of all saints, though he owes everything to the love of Christ, yet he does not feel it presumptuous to claim that he, Paul, is called into liberty; he is not bound down to the past or to the opinion of the other Apostles; he dares to take the risk of making dissension in the infant Church, so confident is he of his call. And in this atmosphere of freedom he built up that glorious work for which all Christians thank God. But Newman never won his way into freedom; he grew to be distrustful of himself and of his powers, afraid of his call, afraid of being presumptuous and taking too much upon himself; he never accomplished his full work and the whole world has been the loser.

So, then, we take our leave of this great man, not without sadness, yet not without instruction. But if we cannot be blind to his mistake, let us also be sure that we imitate those virtues of zeal, industry, affection, and enthusiasm which he possessed in so signal a measure.

J. F. MOZLEY.

## Art. 5.—FRENCH TAXATION AND THE FRANC.

1. *The Financial Crisis in France.* By the Hon. George Peel. Macmillan, 1925.
2. *The French Debt Problem.* By Harold G. Moulton and Cleona Lewis, with the aid of the Council and Staff of the Institute of Economics at Washington. Allen & Unwin, 1926.

READERS of St Simon's memoirs may be reminded of the passage in which the Duke describes the efforts of the Regent in 1715 to induce him to accept the direction of the finances of France; and records in a few terse and powerful sentences his conviction that the alternative before the rulers of the country was either to crush it by the continued augmentation of all possible sources of taxation in the attempt to meet the immense obligations imposed by the prodigal reign of Louis XIV, or to take advantage of a new reign to repudiate the liabilities of the old one, a course which would bring ruin wholesale upon multitudes of families. He confessed that if he had accepted the charge he would have been too strongly tempted to choose total bankruptcy. As between two *effroyables injustices* this seemed to him the less cruel, and it would have the advantage of making much more difficult a repetition of the extravagant expenditure on wars, buildings, and luxury of all sorts which had brought the country to ruin at the end of the reign of the Grand Monarque. But he could not face what he calls the iniquity of either of these courses: 'C'était un paquet dont je ne voulais me charger devant Dieu ni devant les hommes!'

Except for the causes which produced it, the predicament described so forcibly by the Duc de St Simon closely resembles that in which any French Minister of Finance finds himself to-day; and the account of the financial condition of the country in 1715, with its standing debt since the death of Colbert raised to a gigantic height, a large floating debt, the Government without credit raising loans at ruinous cost, its promissory notes, *billets d'état*, circulating at a quarter of their face value and much revenue pledged for two years ahead, is not so unlike the position at the present time as to make

comparison entirely fallacious. It does not do to press historical parallels too far, and financial disorder everywhere produces similar results; but it is interesting to note throughout two centuries of French history, under forms of Government presenting every sort of contrast, the constant recurrence of the same sort of incapacity in the management of public finance and taxation, the prevalence of hand-to-mouth methods, and the tendency to outrun revenue and resort to borrowing combined with economy and industry in the sphere of private life. The State is too often spendthrift and debt-ridden, the individuals composing it thrifty, solvent, and even wealthy. There are many distinguished names among French financial statesmen, but none of them since Colbert, save perhaps the first Napoleon and his Ministers, has ever had the same opportunity as fell to the lot of Peel and Gladstone of carrying out beneficial and lasting financial reforms. The abuses of the financial administration of the old monarchical régime are patent to all; they met their retribution in the liquidations, spoliations, and bankruptcies of the French Revolution; but they were due not to poverty but to misgovernment. The Consulate and the Empire re-established the finances of France and restored her credit; and the solidity and economy of Napoleon's financial administration are shown by the fact that after a quarter of a century of war the total State expenditure had risen only from 531 million francs in 1789 to 931 million francs in 1815, of which the annual debt charge only amounted to 81 millions.

Throughout the 19th century the growing wealth of France kept pace with the growth of public expenditure, which at its close was about six times as great as it had been in 1789; but no process of amelioration in the fiscal system bequeathed by the Constituent Assembly in 1790 and by the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, such as took place in England in the last century, is to be traced in France in all this long period. The attitude of the French population was always antagonistic to the efforts of enlightened financiers. If in the 18th century it was the opposition of interested and privileged classes which brought to nought the reforms of such statesmen as Turgot, in the 19th century it was the people themselves whose prejudice and ignorance stood in the way of

governmental financiers; and modern governments in France, except in periods of revolution, have always followed rather than governed. The fact that France for many centuries was a monarchical and absolutist country has left deep traces on the French character. In England the Government has grown up from and with the people, in France the State is distrusted; the old saying, 'Notre ennemi est notre maître,' still holds good; the intrusion of the *maître* is abhorrent to the Frenchman, and the memory of the fiscal exactions of the *fermiers généraux* of the *ancien régime* still colours his attitude towards the *fisc*, which is so incomprehensible to the Englishman, however much he may resent and dislike oppressive or unjust taxation. The mentality of the peasant, his habit of clinging to his sous, his secrecy as to his private affairs, his hostility to anything approaching inquisition into them, his intense conservatism which in politics shows itself in his steady adherence to the anti-clerical, anti-monarchical Left, is due to historical causes and is still the mentality of France as a whole; and, in spite of the changes caused by the War, this mentality is still to be reckoned with as one of the difficulties which confront French statesmen and weaken financial statesmanship. But the compensating advantages must not be forgotten, the marvellous frugality and industry of the population which, combined with the possession of climate, soil, and natural resources, have created, and will no doubt continue to create, the seemingly inexhaustible wealth which has so often saved France from economic and financial disaster.

Mr George Peel's book which, in addition to being a trustworthy guide through all the mazes of his complicated subject, is written with a charm of style seldom to be found in works on finance, has been welcomed with something like enthusiasm by all those on both sides of the Channel who are trying to form a just estimate of the outcome of the present financial situation in France. It is not his fault if his brilliant survey, and other well-informed publications like Mr Moulton's carefully documented work on 'The French Debt Problem,' have not dispelled many erroneous notions on taxation in France which are still current in this country. It is,

for instance, quite commonly held that France is insufficiently taxed, and that her people cannot be induced to make the sacrifices necessary to enable their Government to balance the budgets. Mr Peel's book, and the facts supplied by even a cursory study of the official figures, make it possible to assert that the very opposite is the case, and that France is suffering not only from taxation which is not properly adjusted to the shoulders which have to bear it, but also from over-taxation. The difficulty of comparing the burden of taxation in this country and in France is notorious. How can we compare the figures of English and French Budgets? A comparison based on the exchange value of the franc must be fallacious when the difference between prices based on exchange value and internal prices is considered. It is true that internal prices tend to rise as the franc falls, but the process is never rapid enough to equalise the price levels of international and imported staple goods and of home products and services, and the two levels can never be actually assimilated while the exchange continues to fluctuate. It would certainly be misleading to convert an income of 100,000 francs into its exchange equivalent at 130 frs. to the £ at 760%.—it is much more likely to be something between 1000% and 1350%, i.e. at some figure based on an exchange of 100 or 80 frs. to the £. The only possible method of calculation is that adopted by Mr Peel and Mr Moulton, to compare the percentage of taxation to national income in each case. But national income can never be more than a matter of approximate estimate, and all that can be done is to accept the figures arrived at by competent statisticians on lines which have stood the test of criticism. Mr Peel, making use of such estimates, quotes figures which confirm the statement made in the 'Economist' of Jan. 31, 1925, that 'France's burden of taxation is rising to, if it had not equalled, that of Great Britain.' Mr Moulton, p. 191, reaches a similar conclusion in words which may here be quoted:

'There is no truth whatever in the prevalent assumption abroad that the French people do not and will not pay taxes. The facts completely contradict this contention, which has been repeated so often that it has come to be almost universally believed. The French tax burden was relatively heavy

before the War as compared with other countries, and it has been very heavily increased since 1918. We refer to collections and not merely to the rates that are levied. The revenues derived by the National Government in 1922 from taxes and fiscal monopolies equalled 27.1 billion francs (or milliards) and the taxes of the departments and communes amounted to about 3 billion francs, making a total of 30 billion francs. Since the national income in that year was only 145 billion francs, it will be seen that the French people paid in taxes fully 20 per cent. of their income. National taxes alone represent nearly 19 per cent. of the national income. This compares not unfavourably with Great Britain where taxes of the central government are estimated to take roughly 18.5 per cent. of the national income' ('London Economist,' April 5, 1924).

Mr Peel, like most writers on the subject, is impressed by the current talk of extensive evasion. Mr Moulton, however, while agreeing that evasion is all too common an evil in France, as in all countries where the burden of taxation is heavy, considers 'that the figures of actual collection of taxes in France constitute the best proof that the evasion evil has been very greatly magnified in public discussions. Let it be repeated,' he adds, 'that the actual collections equal 20 per cent. of the national income.'

These allegations have produced so bad an impression in this country—statements, for instance, such as that the French income tax is a 'farce' being quite common in our press—that some further comment may not be out of place. Mr Peel's many quotations on this question from French sources show pretty clearly that the French have largely themselves to thank for the bad impression thus created. To some extent the evidence may be discounted on political grounds. Much of it consists in the assertions of radical and socialist orators who, unable to contend any longer that the rates of income tax and death duties are not sufficiently onerous or progressive in character, fall back on the cry that the rich escape by defrauding the revenue. M. Dumesnil, for instance, in the debate in the Chamber of Deputies, on Jan. 28 last, made use of a comparison between English and French income-tax payers which has been widely quoted here to the disadvantage of the latter.



He stated that the French *impôt sur le revenu* produced last year 3 milliard francs, while the British income and super tax produced (at 80 frs. to the £) 26 milliards. His comparison was unchallenged either here or in his own country; but the fact remains that, as a comparison, his statement of the French receipts is seriously misleading owing apparently to his omission of large items of taxation corresponding to tax collected from British income-tax payers, namely, that derived from the schedules of the French tax and that derived from the tax on *valeurs mobilières* which is not technically a part of the income tax. If he had included what should have been included for a comparison with the British income tax, his figure for the French yield would have been nearly doubled.

Leakage, however, there is undoubtedly of a serious kind in the assessment and collection of income tax (and probably also of succession duties), but to attribute it entirely to fraudulent evasion is somewhat misleading if defective administration which facilitates it is the root cause of the evil. When it is borne in mind that, when the new tax which ran counter to all the instincts of the people was first brought into force in 1917, the machinery of collection was practically non-existent, it is not surprising that it should be still unequal to an efficient performance of its unpopular duties. A very considerable increase of official personnel is no doubt required; it is said that two hundred additional *contrôleurs* throughout the country would not be excessive, but the cost of collection is already unduly high, and it is no easy matter to recruit officials at the usual too low rates of salary in a country where man-power is short and trade booming. In spite of all this both the number of income-tax payers, which is startlingly inadequate compared with the British figures (especially in the higher classes of income) even allowing for the much lower range of incomes in France, and the yield of the tax, increase year by year, and could no doubt be greatly increased if the radical and socialist proposals for compulsory declarations so often discussed in the Chamber could be put into force.

More serious in its effect on the popularity of the tax is the inequality with which different classes of

income-tax payers are treated under the *impôts cédulaires* (schedules) of the income tax. While clerks and others with emoluments, salaries, and pensions are taxed to the full on the declaration of their employers, the skilled artisan goes scot-free, and members of the liberal professions, doctors, lawyers, and so on, owing to the laxity of the State officials in checking or challenging their returns of income, are thought very largely to evade assessment and payment. It was recently stated in the Chamber that only six doctors in Paris declared incomes of over 100,000 francs, whereas a deputy asserted that there were over 500 earning that amount. But the greatest disproportion occurs in the taxation of the profits of industry and commerce as compared with that of agricultural profits. A significant incident occurred on Feb. 4 last when 250 shopkeepers of the Rue St Honoré closed their premises for two hours in the afternoon by way of protest against this fiscal inequality, placarding their shutters with the statement that while three million tradespeople, including merchants and manufacturers, contribute 8200 million francs in taxes, eight million peasants pay only 82 million francs. We do not profess to be able to verify these figures, nor the further statement that the department of the Seine alone pays 48 per cent. of the total French taxation; but, according to the latest official return (for 1924), the schedule taxing agricultural profits (apart from the land tax and the general income tax) showed only 309,700 persons assessed and contributing the insignificant total of 42,724,000 francs! Mr Peel in this connexion quotes some remarkable statements made, apparently without contradiction, by a socialist deputy, M. Compère Morel, in the Chamber in February last year. Taking the years from 1918 to 1923, commercial and industrial taxpayers contributed about 4284 million francs to the revenue, salary or wage-earners 1035 millions, non-commercial professions 185 millions, and agriculturalists 95 millions. 'And this,' adds Mr Peel, 'in a country which is one of the great agricultural nations in the world.' M. Compère Morel went on to give an instance of the extremely lenient method of assessment which conduced to this result, that of a wine-grower with 70 acres whose gross income for 1924 was 244,000

francs, his net profit 97,200, his taxable income calculated on the existing basis only 17,175, and his actual payment 1038 !

The question of applying some remedy to this apparent injustice in the incidence of taxation is one which is very largely shirked in France. About 50 per cent. of the population live on and from the soil; except for the capital, great cities like those which abound in Great Britain are not found in France; from an electoral point of view the agricultural or peasant interest is predominant in most departments, and all parties pay court to it, including the socialists, who have been gaining support in several departments and who by showing in their propagandist appeals that the Russian peasant has been no loser by the Bolshevik revolution, are trying to disarm the individualist prepossessions of the French peasant and displace the Radical *gauche* in his affections. Apart, however, from any political considerations, there is an almost insuperable difficulty in assessing to an income tax a mass of landowners mostly small and many very small, making a good living when they can work their farms themselves, but consuming mainly their own produce and keeping no accounts, and, in the case of the larger proprietors, hampered by the scarcity of labour, which is dear and bad.

The yields per acre in France before the War were low as compared with those of other countries; the margin of profit has always been small; and the rural exodus due to the War has caused a decline in acreage in spite of the acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine. Similar conditions would have made the application of income-tax methods impossible even in England. It is true that there has been improvement in the lot of the small and middle peasantry and that owners who have remained on the land have taken advantage of the post-war prosperity of 1918-20 to pay off mortgages and increase and round off their holdings. The tendency has been for properties of 15 to 50 acres to gain at the expense of the very small and the very large holdings. But the improvement in their economic position has not made them more amenable to taxation. It has increased restlessness and discontent and inspired incessant demands on the State for assistance in the supply of labour,

fertilisers, better transport, building, electrification, and so on.

'Il ne faut pas embêter le paysan,' is a maxim which can only be disregarded at the risk of discouraging agricultural production. It is difficult to bring home to this population the necessity of contributing to the revenue. They are too ignorant to see the connexion between the lack of revenue and the fall in the value of the franc and of their Government investments and hoardings; they look only at the higher prices they get for their produce. All this does not mean any prospect of a greatly increased yield from attempts to collect income tax; and it is more than doubtful whether taxation in this form can ever be made good business from a fiscal point of view except in the case of large proprietors, the target of the Socialists. But some remedy is necessary, and might, it seems, be sought rather in the improved assessment of the land tax (as distinguished from the tax on income from agricultural profits), as to which the 'Inventaire' states that the 'figures which are entered on the registers do not appear to represent more than one-half of the receipts which a proper valuation would provide'; or perhaps in some form of flat rate tax on production such as Mr Leake has suggested as a substitute for the British income tax, which might be more applicable to French than to British conditions.

Enough has been said to indicate that the term 'evasion' is not a sufficient explanation of the insignificant yield of the tax on agricultural profits; but it applies with greater force to another branch of the revenue, that on the income derived from securities (*valeurs mobilières*). This arises from the prevalence of bearer bonds which cannot be taxed at the source; and registration of some kind, at a cost in clerical labour which has hitherto stood in the way of reform, is the only remedy which could be effective. Advocates of the *Carnet* system, by which no coupon could be cashed except on presentation of a list countersigned by the revenue authorities setting forth the details of the bonds from which income is derived, have asserted that if the income derived from bearer bonds were brought into account, the revenue from income tax alone might be increased to a total of something like 30 milliards! Its

opponents, on the other hand, insist that such a measure would not bring in more than 400 or 500 millions.

The truth is that no safe estimate can be formed of the amount of this evasion. But the correspondent of the 'Economist' remarks in this connexion (Dec. 19, 1925):

'Examination of the facts leads to the conclusion that complaints in regard to evasion of income tax in this country are greatly exaggerated. Official statistics show that given issues of bearer bonds are so widely distributed among investors that the holders of the enormous majority of them could never be held liable to income tax. M. Louis Daussat, for instance, showed two years ago that the 12,216,712 *obligations* issued by the Ville de Paris are held by no fewer than 4 million persons. The late M. Alfred Neymarck, in 1912, showed that the 1,376,760 registered shares of the French railway companies were held by 151,986 persons, giving an average of about nine shares per holder. Figures furnished by the Finance Ministry show that the number of small holders of French Rentes, whose holdings do not represent more than 350 francs of interest per annum, amount to over two millions. The foregoing will perhaps suggest that the widespread belief that the Frenchman as a rule evades payment of income tax is not so well founded as it appears to be; and that, like another popular theory as to the excessive proportion of indirect taxation levied in this country, it should be received with a good deal of caution.'

Mr Peel supplies us with the fullest material for a judgment on this latter point, to which some reference is necessary because the changes which have been effected in the system of French taxation since the War are hardly even now appreciated in this country. Nothing would be more interesting, if space allowed, than to trace the course of the struggle by which direct taxation, championed with good reason by economists and financiers in search of revenue and sometimes with excess of zeal by radical doctrinaires, has gradually won its way in two countries so differently situated as France and England; or to follow Mr Peel in his admirably clear historical summary of direct and indirect taxation in France since the Revolution. We can only note the rather unexpected conclusion at which, following some French authorities, he arrives, that, in the year or so

preceding the late War, the proportion in which taxation whose primary incidence was on property (perhaps only by some stretch of language to be described as direct) stood to indirect taxation was as 46 per cent. to 54 per cent. We are not sure that the distinguished grandson of Sir Robert Peel gives quite sufficient weight to the historical considerations which, as we have seen, largely account for the instinctive revolt in the French mind against any form of taxation implying inquisition into private affairs. No one, however, was a severer critic of the system which had grown up, of the almost exclusive place which indirect taxation had assumed in it, of the extreme variety, multiplicity, and complication of the taxes and their unfair incidence on the poorer classes, and of the budgetary difficulties incidental to such revenue methods, than M. Caillaux in the early years of the present century. His enlightened efforts, as Minister, to introduce a corrective in the shape of a modern income tax were consistently thwarted by interested opposition, and it was only the imperative need to tap new sources of revenue after the War which brought about the ultimate triumph of his ideas. In contradistinction, therefore, to England, whose revenue system, modernised, flexible, and expansible in the highest degree and in all its parts, was equal to all the demands made upon it, France was already in 1914, in M. Caillaux's words, the 'most heavily burdened of all the countries in the world,' with an antiquated and quite inelastic fiscal system and a debt, about double that of her ally, which absorbed 20 per cent. of her total State expenditure. It was no wonder then when the War began something like a débâcle in the administration should have occurred, that with the growing calls on the man-power of the country, the invasion of great industrial areas, and the supposed necessity of making the War 'popular,' the collection of taxes fell to a minimum; with the result that the average revenue for the first five years to the end of 1918 was only a trifle higher than the revenue of 1913, that practically the whole cost of the War was defrayed by borrowings at home and abroad, and that the debt which had stood at 35 milliard francs at the beginning of the War increased by 145 milliards at the end. By 1924, the year of M. Clémentel's famous 'Inventaire



de la situation financière de la France,' the *locus classicus* of the whole subject, the War and post-War debt had risen to nearly 300 milliards under the mirage of reparations to be obtained from Germany.

It must not, however, be imagined that no effort had meanwhile been made to increase the yield of taxation. Just before his fall in 1914 M. Caillaux had succeeded in carrying some reforms in the assessment of the tax on agricultural land and on *valeurs mobilières*, and in July of that year his detested income tax (*impôt global sur le revenu*) was passed in a very attenuated form, though the outbreak of the War postponed its operation until 1917, when it was reformed on the lines of his original proposals of 1914. The old so-called direct taxes, except the land tax, were abolished, and, in addition to the general income tax, somewhat of the nature of our super tax though much wider in scope beginning, as it does, with an income of 7000 francs, income began to be taxed under schedules (*impôts cédulaires*) in classes of income, house property, agricultural land, profits from agriculture, profits of industry and commerce, profits from the non-commercial or liberal professions, and emoluments, salaries, and pensions. To this should be added, though not technically belonging to the administration of the income tax, the revenue from securities (*valeurs mobilières*). It was not, however, till 1920 that a really serious effort was successfully made to increase the taxation of the country. The Finance Act of that year, as Mr Peel observes, aimed at producing several additional milliards by increasing the income-tax rates both on the total income and its component parts; by extending up to date the liability of the War-profits tax of 1916; by increasing the inheritance tax; by establishing the productive tax on business transactions; and by largely intensifying the customs duties. The effect of all this was to raise the total revenue from taxation from about 4.1 milliards in 1913 to about 21.9 milliards in 1923, including the War-profits tax, but excluding all local taxes; and to alter the proportions of tax revenue to 51 per cent. on property, and 49 on consumption. [It may be noted that 1000 million francs, or one milliard, is equal, at a rate of exchange of 100, to 10,000,000£.]

Not only, as Mr Peel points out, have the French

financiers in their organisation of the new direct taxation

'redressed the inequality incidental to the taxation of articles of consumption by the agency of the direct taxes, but they have established a humane and wise system in accordance with modern conceptions of exonerations at the base, of progressive rates of levy, and of allowances in respect of family obligations. And these methods were sought to be applied not only to the direct taxes on revenue but also to the indirect taxes on consumption'

by the institution of sumptuary taxes such as the *taxe de luxe*, the taxes on motor-cars and theatrical performances. All this, it may be noted, was accomplished before the 'Cartel des Gauches' came into existence with the election of May 1924, since when the rates of the direct taxes and the principle of progression in the income tax have been carried to an impracticable extreme culminating in the increases rushed through by M. Loucheur on Dec. 4 last. M. Doumer, on Jan. 31 last, estimated that the taxation of 'wealth' amounted to 70 per cent. of the total revenue, including in this the sumptuary taxation indirect in character, while the taxes on necessary articles of consumption amounted to only 30 per cent. And the total revenue was estimated by M. Caillaux for 1926, without the new taxation since proposed, at over 32 milliards.

It would be useless to deny that this great effort came too late, and that the neglect to obtain a greater yield from taxation on the opening of hostilities was not largely responsible for the actual difficulties of the situation, for this very admission is made in M. Clémentel's *inventaire* of 1924. But the fact that a great effort, even if it was inadequate to the gravity of the situation, was at last made is in itself a refutation of the belief, still too prevalent in this country, that France is unwilling and unable to face taxation. The criticisms which may fairly be made are of a different order.

It would be impossible in these pages to follow step by step the development of the financial situation till it has reached its present pass, or do more than draw attention to one or two main points in the policy of the

various ministries which have been brought into power since the General Election of May 1924 by the dominance of the combination of Radical and Socialist groups known as the 'Cartel des Gauches.' That election, which was the result of a popular reaction against the 'imperialist' policy of M. Poincaré and the 'Bloc National' as exemplified in the occupation of the Ruhr, incidentally brought into untimely prominence the fiscal and economic theories of the Socialist party, and has ended by greatly compromising the progress towards saner financial methods which might have been hoped for after the danger signal given to the country by the catastrophic fall of the franc in March 1924. The alarm had been sounded, the people had begun to take fright after nearly a decade of lavish lending to their own Government, the flight from the franc, though temporarily checked by the Morgan credit, had set in; and what was needed was a steady, united, administrative effort. What happened instead was a sensational speech in July 1924 by M. Herriot, the new Prime Minister, declaring that the financial issue had now become the master question, that he was there to save the country from financial anarchy and tell the truth however painful it might prove to be, and that, in spite of the drastic provisions of the budget of the previous March, with its 20 per cent. increase in direct taxes, those provisions were again insufficient, and there still remained a deficit of 4 milliards to be made up in the current year. As it turned out, although the revenue had been increased by 27 per cent.—from 21 to 27 milliard francs—the deficit actually amounted to 16 milliards.

Over and over again had M. Herriot and his friends vehemently asserted that there should be no more inflation; but if budgets could not be balanced there was no alternative way of meeting these gigantic recurring deficits except by borrowing, and borrowing in the circumstances inevitably meant further inflation, a further decline in the franc with increasing difficulty in balancing the budget, and a further rise in the level of prices. So flagrant a contradiction between precept and practice, so patent a combination of alarmist talk with inaction or action which merely intensified alarm, was an all-sufficient explanation of the *crise de confiance*

which has been in full blast ever since, and which has had sinister results both as regards debt and taxation. The policy of the Socialist party which has succeeded, as extreme parties are apt to do, in imposing its ideas on other sections of the Left, has been laid down in the speeches of one of the ablest of its leaders, M. Léon Blum ; and comprises such items as expropriation by means of a capital levy, repudiation by the State of promises such as the exemption of rentes from taxation, and the consolidation of short term borrowings, which means that the State need not fulfil its obligations to repay Treasury bills falling due on a certain date—the *théorie de la faillite*. Coupled with this, in the sphere of taxation goes opposition to all indirect taxation, still the mainstay of French finance, as oppressive to the poor, and an almost fanatical insistence on direct taxation of which, however, the poorer classes were to be carefully relieved, an exemption limit as high as 30,000 francs having been proposed in recent discussions. Since the rates are admittedly now as high as, or higher than, industry can support, the advocacy of direct taxation takes the form of violent denunciation of evasion by the rich, of proposals not only for the compulsory declaration of income and heavy penalties (already in existence) for fraud or evasion, but of the publication of incomes declared by the taxpayers, a certain means in France of setting man against man and class against class. As to bearer bonds, earlier suggestions of the *carnet* or the *bordereau* were even superseded by a proposal to transform the whole mass of these bonds, which the expert revenue official consulted described as necessary to the economic life of France, into something closely resembling inscribed stock—a proposal which the same expert declared would ‘upset the national economy.’

It is no doubt the case that much of this programme, even as regards the treatment of the debt, may, in other hands than those of the socialists, eventually find a place in the fiscal policy of France ; and that, leaving aside suggestions inspired by class animosity, there is little in it which would not meet with acceptance by advanced parties in this country—much of it, indeed, having been inspired by English example. But it is evident that a tax policy which has been carried by degrees

very far, perhaps too far, in Great Britain, and is here coupled with a vast system of public assistance, socialist in character, to the poorer class of the community, may be totally unsuited to a country in which property, whether in land or investments, is so widely distributed; where the larger incomes are comparatively rare and the amount of revenue to be derived from their taxation, however exorbitant, without endangering the economic life of the nation, comparatively insignificant; and where the sentiment of personal independence is so deeply implanted in individuals of all classes. It must be remembered that France, like Italy, is rootedly individualist, and it is indeed not a little remarkable that the socialist and communist parties which, whatever may be the case with some of their bourgeois leaders, are undoubtedly as a whole out for confiscation and revolution—or at all events have created that impression in a country where ideas are treated seriously—should have obtained so much more influence in the present Chamber than their real importance entitles them to. It is true that, as French history teaches from the Revolution downwards, the bourgeois classes have every virtue except political courage, and that conservatism is always at a disadvantage in defence against resolute radical attack in France as elsewhere. And socialism has the peculiar advantage in the present Chamber of being able to push its attack without fear of being brought to book by the responsibility of office. It may to some extent be superseding the older radicalism in France (as in this country) as a political force, but it has obtained its present adventitious position in Parliament as the result of the system recently established of *scrutin de liste* combined with a bastard form of proportional representation which has made a strong and homogeneous majority impossible. The position was well described by a criticism of M. Blum on the occasion of his brilliantly clever speech in support of M. Painlevé's financial programme on the eve of his fall. 'He commands,' it was said, 'without taking responsibility; he forces the Ministry to introduce into legislation the beginnings of collectivism hoping that pure collectivism and much else will follow; *il engage et il se dégage*.'

The result has been to paralyse Parliamentary action  
Vol. 246.—No. 488.

at a time when a definite and decided policy was essential, and to give rise to nearly all the evils which Socialism might well have produced if installed in power without the compensating advantage of strong Government. Both M. Herriot and M. Painlevé fell on account of half-hearted attempts to pander to views which merely increased the alarm of the public and of the Senate. Under the influence of the socialists direct taxation has been increased by successive additions to the nominal rates until evasion, which was mainly the result of imperfect legislation and inefficient administration, has now given place, according to the latest accounts, to a widespread determination to escape from impositions admittedly unfair and oppressive to the trading and industrial classes, and to fresh exportations of capital to avoid the recent heavy increases of income tax. We may quote from a recent number of the 'Economist' some instances in which the taxation of dividends already amounts to 45 per cent., 50 per cent., or even 70 per cent.

	Dividends payable.		Net sum receivable after deduction of tax.
	Frs.		Frs.
Banque Transatlantique . . . .	6.25	..	3.74
Banque de l'Union Parisienne. . .	10	..	3.95
Suez Canal, capital share . . . .	140	..	89.683
Nord, capital share . . . . .	90	..	9.022
Mines de Courrières . . . . .	12	..	5.33
Etablissements Kuhlmann . . . .	10	..	3
Rafferie, say . . . . .	100	..	66.20
Ripolin (paintmakers) . . . . .	60	..	14.10

With all this the budget, with the continued decline of the franc, is as far as ever from balancing, and both note circulation and the debt continue to grow. The full application of socialist theories to the treatment of the debt problem could hardly have had a more disastrous effect upon credit than the threat of them has actually had on the whole financial situation.

The existence of a relatively great floating debt, always a source of potential danger to the State, emerged in the year 1925 as a factor which upset all financial provisions. While the perpetual and long term debt stood (Nov. 30, 1924) at 153,716 million francs, the



short term debt, Treasury Bills (2 to 10 years), National Defence Bonds (5 to 10), Credit National Bonds, etc. stood at 39,845 milliards; and the floating debt, including ordinary Treasury Bills, National Defence Bills, and advances to the Bank of France (22,800 milliards, which took the form, broadly speaking, of an immense increase in note circulation) amounted to 90,688 millions. Not far, therefore, from one half of the internal national indebtedness (the Foreign Debt is omitted in this statement) was in the position of constantly falling due and constantly having to be renewed, and no proper precautions had been taken in the case of the Treasury Bills and National Defence Bonds to distribute the maturities so as to avoid the possibility of important repayments to the lenders within the course of a single year. The year 1925 was particularly critical in this respect, for besides some heavy foreign calls no less than 21,950 million francs fell due in that year, 333 millions in February, 3290 millions in July, 8237 in September, and 10,090 in December. Successful re-borrowing depends on the confidence of the lenders. Already in 1924 notes were being hoarded and the renewals of National Defence Bonds becoming less brisk; but it was the absorption of liquid funds by commercial operations during a boom year which dried up the market for Government Bonds and made it necessary for the Treasury, which found itself without money for operating expenses at the beginning of 1925, to resort, for the first time since 1920, to direct borrowing from the Bank of France. Yielding to powerful pressure, reinforced by the demand for more currency caused by business activity, that great and well-managed institution was induced to increase its advances, and also the amount of the note issue, beyond the legal limit; and the subsequent Act establishing a legal maximum of 45 milliard francs for advances to the Government was not to be the last measure of such expansion which pointed ominously to a further decline of the franc and a possible repetition of the German débâcle.

We will not follow Mr Peel in his dramatic account of the events of last year—of the fall of M. Herriot on the revelation of the irregular complicity of the Bank of France with his Government and his proposal under

socialist pressure for a modified form of capital levy; of M. Caillaux's acceptance of office under M. Painlevé after the disappearance of two finance ministers in a week; of the belated passing of his severe and complicated budget in July. The various devices in the way of loans, of fresh extensions of the limits of advances from the Bank and of the note issue, the continued fall of the franc and rise of prices, the increase of hoarding of notes by the public and increasing reluctance to renew the National Defence Bonds falling due in increasing numbers which, as we have seen, was playing such havoc with the finance of the year—all this took its course while 'M. Renaudel, the Socialist leader, was repeating his lugubrious anthem, "We will take the money where we can find it!"' After the Nice Congress and the fall of M. Caillaux owing to his refusal to endorse the Socialist nostrum of a capital levy, M. Painlevé was forced by the Parliamentary situation into greater reliance on the Socialist party, to meet the fate of his predecessor in an attempt to combine a measure of inflation (which would have been insufficient) with what was virtually a three-years' moratorium for short term bonds, in order to meet the great maturity—falling due on Dec. 8. It was only on the accession to office of M. Briand, fresh from the Locarno triumph, that the Chamber was roused to abandon a purely negative attitude. Within days only of the fatal date M. Loucheur, the new Finance Minister, who found the Treasury empty, was able to rush through his plan of raising the limit of allowable advances from the Bank of France from  $33\frac{1}{2}$  milliard francs to  $39\frac{1}{2}$  milliards, and the circulation of notes from 51 to  $58\frac{1}{2}$  milliards, and covering this inflation by accelerating tax returns to the extent of three milliards and raising another three milliards from the direct taxes, including an increase of 20 per cent. on the general income tax, coupled with still larger increases in the income-tax schedules for land and house property, industrial and commercial profits, as well as in income from securities.

It remains to be seen whether increases so excessive will not either prove completely illusory or, if exacted, will not have a crushing effect on industry. To expect the middle classes to pay from 35 to 40 per cent. of their incomes is to court revolt. But the main point is that

M. Loucheur's inflation saved France from a general moratorium and a complete breakdown of credit. If direct taxation has already been extended beyond the limit of capacity and increase of indirect taxation is politically impossible, there is no alternative to inflation, a form of capital levy which, at all events, affects all classes and strikes at the wage-earner and the peasant who so largely escape legitimate taxation, while to the rentier it may be a matter of indifference whether he is hit by one or the other method so long as the fall of the franc is not arrested. M. Loucheur denied that inflation was inflation if accompanied by taxes bringing the same amount into the Treasury, and described it as *inflation gagée*. But the course of events in 1925, when 11½ millions of new notes were hoarded instead of coming back to the Treasury in the form of short term loans or deposits, hardly supports this theory; and the next stage of the *crise de confiance* is to be feared in which the desire to hold goods instead of cash will bring the notes out of hiding and cause prices to soar. As a matter of fact, this three milliards was speedily diverted from its original purpose and became a part of the ordinary receipts of the Treasury. For the moment, however, inflation had again saved the situation, and there seemed a fair prospect that the end of the crisis was in sight. The December repayments had proved less than had been anticipated and amounted to only a third of the 10,090 millions falling due; only one large maturity, 6189 millions in May, was in sight; and the revenue returns for December showed a satisfactory response to M. Loucheur's speeding-up plan of Dec. 4, income tax scandalously overdue having been recovered to the amount of 1531 millions—almost three times the corresponding figure for December 1924, while the revenue return for January reached the record total of 4000 million francs, largely for the same reason.

The political situation had been cleared up by the break up of the Cartel owing to the decision of the Socialist party not to co-operate with the Government, and their known reluctance to bring about another political crisis, at a time when they were unable to assume power themselves, by forcing the resignation of M. Briand. It was hoped, therefore, that his great

prestige, the popularity of his foreign policy, and his adroitness in party management, would enable his new Finance Minister, M. Doumer, to carry a budget honestly remodelled, the main features of which, after the retention of M. Loucheur's new direct taxation, were the introduction of an extraordinary and temporary tax on payments, faulty no doubt in principle and detested by the Socialists, but possessing the overwhelming advantage of being largely and immediately productive; a considerable increase in the price of the State tobacco; and the inclusion of a provision of 2 milliards for the reduction of the debt owing to the Bank by the Treasury and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  milliards towards the redemption of the national debt.

These fair hopes were soon overclouded. The opening of the new session was marked by an unprecedented encroachment on the province of the executive, and the Finance Commission of the Chamber dominated by Socialists and semi-Socialists, totally ignoring the need for immediate revenue, proceeded to elaborate an immense and complicated scheme of their own which completely emasculated the Doumer proposals. The discussion on these proposals was allowed to continue for weeks by a minister cynically indifferent to the realities of the financial position so long as he could maintain a Parliamentary balance and his control of foreign policy; and it was accompanied by many incidents outside which testify to the exasperation caused by the nature of the new taxation proposals, the most significant of which was a memorial presented to the President of the Republic by the officials attached to the Ministry of Finance against the whole trend of the various financial proposals. They insisted, among other things, that the Budget can be balanced without additional taxation, that to impose it would be useless because the present staff find it impossible to collect existing taxes, and that a better yield could be produced by the reduction of some of these. Public confidence, which had seemed to be reviving, was again reduced to a very low level. Notices had come in for the repayment of about 50 per cent. of the large bond issue maturing in May instead of the normal proportion of from 25 to 35 per cent.; purchasers of National Defence Bonds were

increasingly investing in one-month bonds instead of absorbing six or twelve month issues; and talk of an impending fresh inflation, though officially denied, began to gain currency and became increasingly more probable through the delay in passing the new finance bill which, it was calculated, was costing the country at least 20 million francs a day.

M. Briand's policy in the Chamber was probably influenced by the vain hope that by giving rope to the Socialists he would disarm their opposition. Whatever his motives, he pursued it, to the extent of alienating essential moderate support, until growing financial embarrassment and the irritation of public opinion forced him into action; and, under the threat that the Government would challenge a vote of confidence, the Chamber on Feb. 16 voted a heterogeneous mass of financial measures from which all M. Doumer's distinctive proposals had been eliminated and which, in spite of the inclusion of M. Loucheur's 3 milliard increase in the direct taxes, fell short of the necessary provision of 8800 millions by nearly 4000 million francs. The gap was to be filled up by the Senate, to which body it was left to set up an adequate measure of taxation by re-incorporating a sufficient proportion of the original proposals to enable the Budget to be honestly balanced.

M. Doumer was successful in bringing back a provision of 5420 million francs from the Senate, which the Chamber again proceeded to whittle away until little remained of the famous 'express train.' By the sacrifice of anything like consistent, constructive, financial policy M. Briand all but succeeded in prolonging the life of his administration over the fateful meeting of the League of Nations which it was vital that he should attend as Prime Minister of France. But in the early morning of March 6, an adverse note on the tax on payments, which he had described as the 'neuralgic point' of the debates, gave the death-blow to his Government. Early in the following week another Government with M. Briand at its head was constituted in order to enable that statesman to deal with the crisis at Geneva; but it is not pretended that there is a prospect of the financial problem being solved, even if it is tackled by his new Minister of Finance, M. Raoul Péret. For M. Briand's failure seems

at least to have demonstrated that no majority for such a purpose can be created in the present Chamber by opportunist tactics however consummate. There is perhaps a possibility that public alarm and a tardy realisation of the danger of further delay may even now cause the Chamber to respond to strong leadership by a master of finance like M. Caillaux, if he were brought into office with a free hand to put an end to a chaotic and menacing situation. Failing this, the most that can be expected is that M. Briand should remain in office long enough to provide for the immediate needs of the Treasury, and to pass a measure of electoral reform with a view to the dissolution of an impracticable Chamber.

The calamitous influence of party politics upon finance could not have been more strikingly illustrated than by the series of events which have culminated in the present crisis. Neither from the financial nor the political point of view can the result of the long-drawn-out conflict of the last two years be considered as other than deplorable. It is enough to note that the Herriot, the Painlevé, and the Briand Cabinets, left the franc at 92, 120, and 135 respectively. It is more than doubtful whether the Treasury will be able to avoid yet another measure of inflation, in spite of M. Doumer's warning in the Senate on Feb. 24, that in less than a year the note circulation had been increased by 17 milliard francs, that the notes created by advances to the Treasury stood at 34,600 million, and that further resort to fiduciary inflation would entail a 'mortal' crisis. The opportunity, in short, for a real measure of financial *assainissement* has once more been missed; and the public attention has been diverted from this essential question to projects for Parliamentary or electoral reform, perhaps even to more far-reaching methods of putting an end to legislative impotence in financial matters. If indeed events have brought into disfavour the doctrinaire pursuit of unrealisable ideals by the Socialist parties, they have at the same time so greatly discredited Parliamentary institutions that never in the whole history of the Republic have they stood lower in public estimation. The old maxim, 'Give us good politics and we will give you good finance,' has been superseded, as a recent observer



remarks, by another—'No more politics and we will give you good finance.'

The late Mr Walter Page remarked in one of his letters, 'There is something better than good government and that is government in which all the people have a part.' One is tempted to doubt the truth of this aphorism of orthodox republicanism, in its application at all events to finance, when one contemplates the plight to which the French Chamber has reduced the country. The sanest critics of events in France maintain that had it not been for the difficulties created by the political situation we should have witnessed long ere this an amelioration of the finances.

M. Chéron, the reporter of the commission of finance in the Senate, did much to reduce the financial question to its proper proportion when he insisted on the progress which had been made in immensely increasing the revenue from taxation and even in reducing expenditure; in bringing deficits down from 20,000 million in 1920 to 1345 million in 1925; and when he pointed to the floating debt, and especially the 45,600 million of National Defence Bonds, as the real crux of the situation, only soluble by a restoration of confidence. 'However grave the situation,' he said, 'it is not desperate, all that is needed is unity and resolution.'

Confidence is a delicate plant, and the reiteration of brilliant arguments for and against every form of taxation and every plan for dealing with the burden of the debt from bankruptcy to currency inflation, which results in little but a rapid succession of Finance Ministers and a continuous decline in the value of the franc, is clearly not the way to inspire it. The one essential preliminary to any real improvement is the honest balancing of the Budget; and experience seems to show that the Budget cannot be balanced until some means can be found of eliminating the baleful effects of party and Parliamentary contentions. It is difficult to believe that the way out cannot still be found within the resources of the constitution if it is once realised the future of the country depends upon it. What is required, in the opinion of those best qualified to judge, is a small commission of independent experts to work out a general plan covering the whole ground. As regards taxation, preceding

paragraphs will indicate the nature of the questions to be studied, the most pressing perhaps of which is the unequal incidence of the income tax which falls ruinously on certain classes and individuals while allowing others to escape. It is dangerous to ask too much of a new form of taxation which has the future before it, and the main point is to obtain from all those who are subjected to it a full return to reasonable and moderate assessments. These are largely matters of administration; and it is more than time that the administrative aspects of problems of taxation, always of the first importance, should receive fuller attention in France. In the same manner the whole tax system which, as we have seen, is a century and a quarter old, which is costly and cumbrous and which imposes a much heavier burden on the population than is justified by its returns, should be revised, and the functions of the million and a quarter *employés* thoroughly overhauled. The same considerations apply to public administrations like the railways, which should cease to be a source of expense; and to State monopolies like tobacco, which brings in only one-third of the British tax on tobacco although the number of consumers and the amount consumed do not differ materially in the two countries. It is inconceivable that a 'Geddes' committee and a 'Colwyn' committee (for both would be necessary) could not institute reforms the effect of which, both in producing economy and in increasing revenue, would be far beyond anything ever suggested by Ministers as possible.

An even wider field for the activity of such a committee would be the whole series of questions connected with the stabilisation of the currency and the management of the debt, and especially of the floating debt. But the vital point is that the programme formulated by the Committee should be accepted and put in force as a whole, and should not be liable to be lopped of some of its features by a finance commission of the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies; and that it should be given the authority of a Dawes plan, not, however, imposed by foreigners, and present a scheme which should govern at least two or three Budgets in succession.

We make no apology for this slight sketch of a plan

of reform of which eminent French authorities are known to be in favour and suggestions of which are often hinted at in the French press. It has the great merit that it involves no constitutional change, it postulates no impossible dictatorship, it requires merely a Minister with the common sense to set up his commission of experts, and the strength to impose its recommendations, which a Parliament, fearing any longer to play with fire, would not dare to refuse. There can be no doubt that, by resort to some such method which would eliminate for a sufficient period the mischievous intervention of party politics, it would be possible, if not even comparatively easy, to balance the Budget, reduce the burden of the debt to manageable proportions, stabilise the franc, and face the question of the Foreign Debt. For France is a rich country. Except for a relatively short interval, as Mr Moulton observes, she has had no unemployment, and 'has witnessed a period of business expansion of almost unparalleled proportions'; and although the 'greatest building boom in history' has been carried through almost entirely on credit and one of the greatest periods of industrial expansion has been financed largely on the basis of borrowed money, the bulk of which has come from domestic currency inflation (the greater part of the funds used having been drawn indirectly from the Bank of France); still, with the reconstructed areas, with the renewed factories and industrial plant, with the rich potash deposits of Alsace and the iron and steel of Lorraine, the economic resources of France are very considerably larger than before the War. Mr Moulton estimates that the acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine alone has increased the agricultural output of France by 4 or 5 per cent., and the industrial resources as a whole somewhere from 25 to 50 per cent. If France can survive a period of restricted credit, which must follow the total cessation of further borrowing or inflation, she should have an industrial and commercial future which will maintain her among the richest of European nations. But can the supply of liquid funds which is the lifeblood of industry be maintained if they are absorbed by meeting the demands of the bond market which, on the assumption that inflation is to be brought to an end, the Treasury can no longer dispense with by

resorting to the Bank of France for money for current operating expenses?

Presumably the answer is that if the confidence of the French public can be restored by a thorough reorganisation of the Budget revenue and expenditure so that they will maintain their investment in the Government loans, the banks will be able to finance the needs of commerce. But the further question arises—whether even a reorganised tax system will enable the Government to meet the rapidly mounting total of interest on the debt which now amounts to an excessive proportion of the public expenditure. Mr Moulton thinks not; and proposes as the way out a drastic reduction in the interest account as the only manner in which the Budget can be brought to balance. We are inclined to think that he very much underrates the effect of such a revision both of revenue and expenditure as we have indicated as reasonably possible. But when every allowance is made for this, there will remain the necessity of dealing with the Debt which, at its present figure, may well be beyond the capacity of the country to support.

Can French statesmen, therefore, avoid the dilemma between bankruptcy and crushing taxation which the Duc de St Simon felt unable to face two centuries ago? In a sense, of course, any measure which recognises a depreciation in the value of money and of Government securities is an act of bankruptcy; and in the loud outcries raised by the Radical Socialist Left even more vehemently than by the Right against suggestions of stabilising the franc at its present value as 'semi-bankruptcy' and the 'worst expropriation of capital,' in the declaration of M. Herriot no less than M. Doumer, that it is necessary to pursue a policy of 'revalorisation' of the franc, by which is meant its restoration to its former value, we may perhaps find an echo of St Simon's refusal to face repudiation. But there is all the difference in the world between so drastic a step as that and the recognition of actual facts in a manner which need not bring about any further collapse of credit. The economic effects of a vast orgy of credit and inflation cannot be evaded, and have already taken their toll in the depreciation of the franc and all that this phenomenon involves. The great individual suffering which has

occurred from the immense rise of prices in the case of holders of small fixed incomes is now a thing of the past, and serious 'revalorisation' of the franc which would improve their position would mean a measure of deflation which would inflict lasting injury on trade and commerce and cause extensive unemployment. The only alternative to a bankruptcy similar to, though much more far-reaching in its effect than that which occurred in 1797 in France or that which took place in Germany with the disappearance of the mark, is that form of 'semi-bankruptcy' which the Socialists would avoid by the even more ruinous device of a capital levy upon the richer classes, namely, stabilisation of the franc at something like a quarter of its old value. This must come, and with it consolidation in some form of the floating debt, so as to extricate the State from its present intolerable position of having to meet overwhelming maturities at all sorts of irregular intervals. As to conversion of the standing debt, it is believed that the public, which only requires security and which now seeks it by investment abroad at interest of from  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 2 per cent. and sometimes less, would welcome the establishment of a 3 per cent. stock which could be relied upon to retain its value. A conversion effected with due precautions at the proper moment with the franc stabilised need not, and would not, be looked on as spoliation. It is all a question of confidence, of psychology. The whole plan of reorganisation must hang together. You cannot balance a Budget with any approach to certainty with the franc liable to a catastrophic fall at any moment; you cannot stabilise the franc, even with the free use of the gold in the Bank of France, nor make arrangements such as the constantly proposed 'Caisse d'Amortissement,' until you have a fixed and just revenue system instead of one which is the plaything of political parties and which is nominally augmented once or twice a year by fantastic and unscientific additions to existing rates of very unequal incidence; until, in short, you have an orderly and economical administration of the finances and of the debt. 'No series of minor reforms,' as Mr Moulton observes, 'will effect a solution of France's financial problem, a major operation is required.' A 'major operation' on some such lines as those indicated,

which would be acceptable to sober and well-informed opinion in France, must be attempted without delay if the situation is to be saved; it cannot be effected in a moment; it would require time, perhaps much time, and continuous application, to carry it through; but the mere assurance that it had been taken in hand and that a programme was being formulated by experts trusted by the country and supported by the legislature would effect an almost immediate transformation in the outlook, and put an end to the *crise de confiance* from which so much of the present trouble springs.

He would be a rash man who prophesied the future of France for even six months ahead. It takes a good deal to ruin a great country, and France in the last two centuries alone has survived political and financial vicissitudes which seemed at the time, and were, no less dangerous than the present crisis. But she has survived them at a cost which it should be the object of all good Frenchmen to avoid in future; and they will not need the reminder that, if financial anarchy should continue till it plays havoc with the economic and industrial prosperity of the country, the social disorders which would follow would be fraught with danger to the already discredited Parliamentary system, and even to the Republic itself. It is no easy matter, as the Cartel politicians have discovered, to tell the truth in France without creating panic. But Frenchmen are not indifferent to the opinion of the world, which is only less interested in the recovery and prosperity of their country than themselves. Not many months ago a French writer remarked, 'The prestige which our conduct brought us during the War has been greatly diminished, our Governments are accused of weakness, our technical experts of mediocrity, and the whole country of avarice and lack of fiscal courage.' We share his hope that France will not continue to give to the world the impression of a country which mismanages its affairs, and is unequal to the task of conquering difficulties which are far from being insurmountable, and which are only serious because they have been allowed to become so.

BERNARD MALLET.



# Art. 6.—THOUGHTS ON FOOD, HEALTH, AND STRENGTH.

THE health, strength, and character of plants, animals, and men depend mainly on two factors, on heredity and nutrition. Plant breeders and animal breeders, observing carefully the effects of heredity and of nutrition, have achieved veritable miracles in improving the productions of the vegetable world and of the various breeds of animals. They have converted stunted grasses into wheat yielding prolific crops. They have changed worthless crab-apples into magnificent dessert fruit, dwarf roots and tubers into gigantic ones full of nourishment, etc. According to ancient sculptures and pictures the horses of Greece and Rome were only about as large as donkeys. That may be seen from the Parthenon Frieze at the British Museum on which the Athenian Cavalry is depicted. The Athenian dwarf horse was adopted as the mount of St George on our sovereign piece, for the feet of the rider hang down far below its belly. On the very realistic Dutch pictures of the 16th and 17th centuries also we find dwarf horses and ridiculously small cattle. The extraordinary successes of observant but unscientific agriculturists in improving plants and the strains of domestic animals beyond belief, justify us to hope that we may achieve similar results in improving the health and strength of the human race.

Heredity and nutrition are the great factors which determine the health and strength of men. Sexual selection, if guided mainly by instinct, by love, automatically makes for the improvement of the race, for beauty and strength are the greatest sexual attractions. That may be seen in the mating of all animals, birds, and even insects. However, while men, guided by the wonderful law of sexual selection, are striving to improve the race from generation to generation, they counteract the law of racial improvement to a very large extent by mistaken nutrition.

Nutrition is an all-important factor in developing the health, strength, and character of plants, animals, and men. Every gardener knows that certain plants want certain soils, and that they decline, sicken, and die if

planted in the wrong soil. Every gardener also knows that over-manuring, over-feeding with concentrated food, is deadly. Fresh air is undoubtedly very important, but right food seems vastly more important to men and animals. Animals living in the wilds preferably sleep in burrows, dens, caves, etc., which gives them warmth but little fresh air. African negroes, Asiatic natives, Eskimos, and other primitive men of excellent physique usually sleep in the stifling air of ridiculously small huts to which there is no ventilation. The magnificent Irishmen and Scotsmen of the past were largely raised in tiny evil-smelling shanties. Even our domestic animals shun the fresh air when asleep. Cats, dogs, and other animals curl up and press their noses into their fur, and they like best sleeping in confined quarters, for instance, under a low cupboard, out of the reach of draughts and of fresh air.

While animals and primitive natives disregard fresh air to which we attach rightly very great importance, they are exceedingly conservative in the selection of their food. Most animals rigidly adhere to their customary diet. The most daintily fed cats will kill dirty rats, mice, and birds, and will eat them, fur, bones, feathers, and all. Civilised man is the only animal which readily throws to the winds ancient tradition with regard to food. Civilised man, in selecting his food, merely consults his palate, and he surrenders his critical intelligence to the persuasiveness of cooks, food manufacturers, and food manipulators of every kind. He does not take enough trouble about the food he eats.

We know quite well that the over-refined foods and the unhygienic ways of civilisation are disastrous. We should never dream of raising horses on white bread, sugar, and cooked food, nor should we dream of increasing the strength of horses by feeding them on concentrated, strengthening food, while leaving them without exercise. The magnificent race of fleet horses of the present has been produced by plain, natural feeding, combined with hard physical work. We live on over-refined food, although we know that the kind of food we eat is inappropriate and is disastrous to our animals, and we add to it an abundance of salt, pepper, mustard, sauces, sugar, etc., which, also, we would not give to our animals, knowing that it would be harmful to them.

Besides, no animals, except a few depraved ones which have lost their natural instincts by a long association with man, will eat pungent pickles, sauces, etc., nor will they touch over-sweet food or hot food. A starving cat or dog will refuse milk, soup, or solid food at the extreme temperature at which we consume these habitually.

The idea that food gives strength and health is deeply implanted in the human mind. Since the earliest ages scientists have endeavoured to solve the mysteries of nutrition, and have striven to discover those factors in food which principally supply health and strength. The food of the gods is to be found in the folk-lore of all nations and in all popular religions. Hippocrates and other writers of antiquity were keenly interested in the science of nutrition, and they endeavoured to create concentrated foods by boiling and reducing milk, meat, vegetables, etc. The science of chemistry endeavours to find out what parts of the food provide us with health and strength. Liebig first analysed food-stuffs of every kind, and came to the scientific conclusion that the principal elements of all food were proteins, carbo-hydrates, and fats; in his opinion the animal proteins were the most valuable elements of all, were the true body-builders, and were derived from the similar substances in plants.

Thus the modern ideas of scientific feeding arose. Protein was thought by Liebig to be necessary for muscular work. Men were to be given health and strength by feeding them on meat, eggs, cheese, and other food-stuffs rich in protein. The food elements apart from protein, carbo-hydrate, and fat were disregarded, but were recognised by physiologists to be the essentials for muscular work and energy. The mineral substances contained in our food were not then particularly noticed and were simply called 'ash.' Ash is present in all natural foods and was for the time not deeply considered. The Liebig school spread its ideas to the universities and colleges all over the world. Medical men in those days were brought up in accordance with Liebig's nutritional doctrines, and very naturally the public and the writers of cookery books accepted the Liebig idea. The fact that carbo-hydrates and fats were the essentials for muscular work was omitted and hidden from the public.

The doctrine that our food consists of protein, carbohydrate, fat, ash, and water was preached for a great many decades and became the guiding doctrine of civilised men all over the world. This doctrine was put to the proof by a distinguished chemist about 1912. He fed animals on chemically pure proteins, carbohydrates, and fat with added ash and water, and discovered to his amazement that the unfortunate animals, instead of flourishing on this scientific diet, languished, and died very speedily. The theoretically excellent diet proved deadly.

These experiments showed that the current knowledge was insufficient. It was discovered that the scientifically fed animals recovered miraculously if they were given a trifling quantity of plain natural food, such as milk or meat. A little natural food saved the animals experimented upon from inevitable death. Further experiments were made, and it was found that the withholding of certain natural food-stuffs led to certain clearly marked diseases which henceforward became known as deficiency diseases.

It thus became obvious to those engaged upon the study of nutrition that, apart from proteins, carbohydrates and fats, ash and water, there must be food elements of absolutely vital importance to the body, the existence of which had been overlooked. These obscure substances were given the name Vitamins, and chemists all over the world are trying to isolate them. Modern chemists refer generally to only three vitamins, but natural foods, as distinguished from chemically pure foods, may contain four or more vitamins. The body is a very wonderful and very mysterious machine, and the appliances of the chemist, and even the ultra-microscope, do not yet reveal all the mysteries. It has been discovered that certain food substances which contain no vitamin can be made to possess one of the vitamins by exposing them for a little time to the sun or to certain rays of a special lamp.

The modern biological chemist has enlarged upon the scientific knowledge of his predecessors. For the moment instead of experimenting with test tubes and various instruments and machines, he must experiment with animals whose bodies react to the as yet unisolated

vitamins. Soon this will no longer be necessary as tests for the vitamins are discovered.

As previously stated, food was found to contain protein, fat, and carbo-hydrate and a mineral residue generally called 'ash.' Analysis of this despised ash revealed the extraordinary fact that it contains a large number of minerals which, by way of the earth, the fodder plants and the animals living on them, reach men no matter whether men live on a vegetarian diet or on a meat diet. Moreover, it was found that the ash of the human body contains similar minerals, and that these minerals are as indispensable to the human body as are the recently discovered vitamins.

The chemistry of nature is far more wonderful than the chemistry of man. The humblest plant can create out of earth, water, and sunlight, substances which the chemist with all his wonderful instruments cannot create. Nature has carefully hidden from us the fundamental secrets of life, and we sin against Nature by trying in our vanity to improve upon the wonderful processes which may be hidden from us to the end of time. The object of Science is to find out how Nature does her work. It is a hard problem and will still take years of work.

Until comparatively recent times men lived on the food natural to them, which means on the food which the experience of countless ages had approved of as the best, or to which the human body had become adapted in the course of ages beyond counting. Then the cook and the manufacturer came along and tried to improve upon these traditional food-stuffs, the consumption of which had been accompanied by the physical and intellectual advancement of mankind, and endeavoured to give us health and strength by foods evolved in the factory of the food manipulator.

Until recently bread, made from various grains, had been the staff of life. Bread in every form consisted of coarsely ground grains. With the assistance of modern machinery, millers and bakers produced white flour from which the outer skins and the germ had been removed. The outer skins of grain of every kind contain the precious vitamins and mineral substances which are indispensable elements in building up the body, and the

germ is the egg of the plant. It contains the essence of life. The outer covering of the grain was removed because the public was supposed to favour bread of the greatest whiteness.

Biological chemists have experimented with whole-meal bread and white bread, and they have discovered that rats, mice, birds, and other laboratory animals live, flourish, and beget young when fed exclusively on whole-meal bread, milk, and water, but the same animals will die when fed on white bread. The moral is perfectly obvious to all.

In addition to the mysterious vitamins, and in addition to the numerous mineral elements contained in the outer skins and germ of the grain, the outer skin contains chiefly roughage which is partly broken up in our insides but is mainly excreted by way of the bowel. Now this roughage which has often been regarded as valueless because it is insoluble, is of the very greatest importance to our health and strength. Life is movement. That was already taught by the ancient Greeks and Romans. Stagnation means decay and death. The despised roughage is as indispensable to man and animals as are all the known and unknown substances contained in our food.

The capacity of our stomach and bowels clearly indicates that man was made to live on bulky, not on concentrated, food. The idea that we might carry our dinner about with us in tabloid form in our waistcoat pocket is an absurdity. A well-filled bowel readily empties itself. A bowel containing only a limited quantity of waste matter has no similar impulse. We have been striving to live on concentrated food in the expectation that concentrated food would vastly increase our strength and improve our health. In reality the over-refined and concentrated food-stuffs of civilisation have given us stagnation, constipation, and countless serious diseases which spring from these and which lead to the profound degeneration of our bodies.

The excretions of the human body are eliminated to a very large extent by way of the bowel. Cells are born, decline, and die, and the dead cells have to be got rid of. Now, stagnation in the bowel leads to putrefaction, and the absorption of poisonous matter into the body is followed by general malaise and numerous



diseases which afflict the constipated over-civilised, and which are practically unknown among primitive races leading primitive lives. Among these diseases are appendicitis, diabetes, and cancer.

Nature has a wonderful power of adaptation. The human and the animal body tries to adjust itself to new conditions, but these adjustments have often very undesirable results. The hand of the manual worker becomes callous and horny. The spine of the carrier of heavy burdens becomes bent for the better carrying of the load, and the rubber-like substance between the bones of the spinal column becomes as hard as ivory.

Strength is created by judicious feeding coupled with adequate exercise. Over-feeding accompanied by under-exercise does not strengthen but weakens the body. The leg muscles of a well-fed sedentary man shrink, and when, at the doctor's advice, he abandons over-eating and takes up strenuous exercise, his leg muscles will become strong once more.

Nature has given us strong jaws and exceedingly powerful jaw muscles for the purpose of our using them. If we fail to use our jaws, jaw muscles, and teeth—if we live on soft stuff which may be swallowed without chewing—jaws, jaw muscles, and teeth degenerate. Modern feeding has produced the receding jaw, the narrow nose, the weak throat, decaying teeth, toxic gums and tonsils. These degenerative processes are the reward for living on unsuitable diet.

Every breeder of animals is aware of the supreme importance of strong and healthy teeth, and he encourages the production of healthy and strong teeth, jaws, throats, and the muscles around by supplying his animals with food which will give to their teeth the necessary exercise. Our manufactured food is producing a weak-jawed and almost toothless race, and the stagnation brought about in these structures leads to degeneration, decay, and the creation of poisons which are readily absorbed and which lead to rheumatoid arthritis, heart disease, and other afflictions which are almost unknown among primitive races.

With the vanity of little knowledge we have discarded the most precious food elements, vitamins, minerals, and roughage with which Nature has provided us, and

we have foolishly replaced these precious and indispensable elements with artificial or synthetic dyes, chemical flavourings, chemical preservatives, etc., which are unknown to nature. We are being persuaded by interested parties that the food elements of which we are being deprived are quite unnecessary, if not harmful, and that the chemicals which are being given to us in their stead are quite harmless, if not beneficial. Unfortunately, we know only decades after the event whether great nutritional changes do good or do harm. The mills of God grind slowly.

The health, strength, and happiness of the race depend largely, very largely, on its nutrition. We are better housed, clothed, and warmed in winter than ever we were. The supply of water, of drains, etc., has been improved beyond the imagination of former generations. On the other hand, our food supply has become far worse than it ever has been. We have an enormous variety of food-stuffs fetched from the ends of the earth. The poorest labourer now has a larger selection of food-stuffs than had the emperors of the past. There is glass in his windows, he has pure water laid on, and he has a bath, but he is being poisoned by the shocking ill-treatment of his alimentary canal, which is filled with soft, de-vitaminised, de-mineralised, chemically-coloured, chemically-preserved, and highly-spiced food.

The health, strength, and happiness of the race are being destroyed by faulty nutrition. A far-reaching reform is necessary. We must go back to sound natural food, and replace the stale and pseudo-scientific stuff which is pressed upon us from all sides with the fresh and wholesome food-stuffs of former generations. This is one of the objects of the New Health Society which I have founded in conjunction with other medical men and eminent laymen who are profoundly convinced that the great majority of our diseases are avoidable, and that they are largely due to faulty nutrition. I hope that all who are interested in this most important subject will help us in the heavy task which we have undertaken.

W. ARBUTHNOT LANE.

## Art. 7.—DANTE AND GIOTTO.

DANTE is the most interesting person in literature and Giotto is almost or quite the most interesting person in art. The two men were contemporaries. At one time or another, both dwelt in Florence. Were they friends?

Tradition says that they were. To this it has been added that Giotto was Dante's 'dearest friend,' his 'greatest friend'; and in Sir Sidney Colvin's article on Giotto in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' we are told that 'it is recorded that Dante was Giotto's guest at Padua.' Was it so? Can the tradition be accepted without question? What evidence have we that Giotto and Dante were intimate friends or that one was ever the guest of the other?

Dante was born in the year 1265. According to Vasari, Giotto was born in 1276, and would therefore be Dante's junior by eleven years. So considerable a disparity of age would militate against close friendship.

Antonio Pucci is an earlier and better authority. Born in 1300, and a sort of public trumpeter or herald in Florence, he must have known every one of note in that city. Giotto, during the last few years of his life, was the city architect; and the city architect and the city trumpeter must often have exchanged greetings in the lively streets of Florence. Pucci may have magnified his office at Giotto's funeral. He wrote that Giotto, when he died in January 1337, was seventy years of age. If so, Giotto was born in or about the year 1267, and was only some two years younger than Dante. We can neglect so trifling a disparity.

The bare fact that Giotto painted a portrait of Dante in the palace of the Podestà of Florence can hardly be cited as a proof or indication of intimate personal friendship between the artist and the poet. This—the famous 'Bargello portrait'—has been much debated, not always

---

\* For the Bargello portrait see 'Portraits of Dante from Giotto to Raffael,' by Richard Thayer Holbrook, London, 1911; 'Il Ritratto di Dante,' G. L. Passerini, Firenze, 1921; 'Studi Danteschi, diretti da Michele Barbi,' Volume Quinto, Firenze, 1922; 'Giotto and Some of his Followers,' by Oswald Sirén, Harvard University Press, 1917; 'Geschichte der Kunst,' von Karl Woermann, Leipzig und Wien, 1918. Dr Woermann, following Crowe and Cavalcaselle, thinks that the portrait was painted in 1301—a

without warmth. Most recent critics accept it, or its ruin, as a genuine work of Giotto—painted not earlier than 1334, or some thirteen or more years after Dante's death. Its value as a portrait seems doubtful. As Mr Holbrook justly remarks, a realistic portrait of so early a date would be without a parallel. It is in a religious painting, in a spacious fresco at a considerable height above the spectator's eye. It contains many figures of angels and saints. Dante is in the foreground, represented as a young man of some five and twenty or thirty years of age. The work is, of course, decorative, and in such a work a realistic portrait would be almost as out of place as in a mosaic or a stained glass window. All that we could expect in it would be a certain similitude not irreconcilable with what we happen to know of the original. Consequently, we can hardly say of the Bargello portrait, 'That is Dante.' The best we can say is 'That is Giotto's idealised recollection of Dante as he was in the prime of his manhood forty years ago.'

We must further remember that Giotto, when decorating the chapel of the Podestà, was executing an official commission, and that some of the leading men in Florence would, possibly, have had views of their own concerning any man whom they would delight to honour by granting him so conspicuous a place on the walls of a building which, after all, was the property of the State; and without their consent or the Podestà's, Dante's portrait would never have been allowed to confront that magnate whenever he chose to worship in his private chapel. The portrait may not, after all, be the personal tribute of a great artist to a great poet. In such a place it is quite as likely to be a token or outward and visible sign of a change of heart in the rulers of Florence. Dante had been condemned as a traitor and had, it must be admitted, done something to justify the condemnation. He had made himself the Roger Casement of Florence. He had written a ferocious letter appealing to the Kaiser of his day to destroy his native city. He had comforted an enemy who was greatly to

---

date which, as Mr Holbrook had already remarked, is preposterous. Mr E. V. Lucas says 'probably 1300' ('A Wanderer in Florence,' p. 177, London, 1923). Venturi (*Storia dell' Arte Italiana* Milan, 1907, v, 448) says 1334 'in all probability.'

be feared. But his fame had grown and was growing. The sentence passed on him had not, indeed, been revoked. It still stood in the books of the city but not, perhaps, in the hearts of the citizens. A new generation was arising that could afford to forget the bitter animosities of the past. A reconciliation or, at least, an amnesty was due to one who, if he had hated Florence, had also loved her. He was her most brilliant son. Presently she was to beg that his remains might find their last resting-place within her walls. Giotto may have been glad to paint that figure in his fresco, but we are inclined to regard it, not so much as an offering of friendship as the firstfruit of that homage which the city of Dante's birth has not ceased, and will not cease, to pay to her great poet, in whose breast love and hate had contended for so many years. The cruelty which Dante, justly or unjustly, laid to her charge, had been conquered. To the great dead Florence was unbarring her gates—granting too late his prayer that he might return as poet with the laurel crown.

'Se mai continga che il poema sacro,  
 Al quale ha posto mano e cielo e terra  
 Sì che m'ha fatto per più anni macro,  
 Vinca la crudeltà, che fuor mi serra  
 Del bello ovile, ov' io dormii agnello  
 Nimico ai lupi che gli danno guerra;  
 Con altro voce omai, con altro vello  
 Ritornero poeta, ed in sul fonte  
 Del mio battesimo prenderò il capello.' \*

That Giotto was allowed to paint the Bargello portrait may, then, be accepted as the beginning of the fulfilment of Dante's wistful longing. Florence was relenting. Dante, if he had sinned against her, had climbed, or was again more slowly climbing, the Mount of Purgation and

---

\* 'If e'er it happen that the Poem Sacred,  
 To which both heaven and earth have set their hand,  
 So that it many a year hath made me lean,  
 O'ercome the cruelty that bars me out  
 From the fair sheepfold where a lamb I slumbered,  
 An enemy to the wolves that war upon it,  
 With other voice forthwith, with other fleece  
 Poet will I return, and at my font  
 Baptismal will I take the laurel crown.'

'Paradiso,' xxv, 1-9.

perhaps drinking of the waters of Lethe. After Lethe, Eunoë—evil forgotten and all fair memories quickened.

Dante mentions Giotto in the 'Divina Commedia,' and by what seems to be one of the queerest freaks of commentators this mention is commonly cited as an eulogy and a proof of friendship. Even Scartazzini calls it praise,\* and Signor Carrà, in his recently published 'Giotto,'† concludes from the famous line in question that 'there is no doubt that Dante felt a strong friendship for Giotto, but there is no reason to suppose that in this case his friendship induced him to exaggerate.' Signor Carrà, adds elsewhere in the same book, 'Suffice it to say that a great friendship bound the two great men. Dante cites Giotto in the "Divina Commedia" as the most famous painter of his day. Giotto introduced Dante into his frescoes, notably in the case of the chapel of the Podestà of Florence, painted somewhere about 1334.' We are glad to agree with Signor Carrà on the date of the Bargello portrait, and we should have felt grateful if he had given us full information of the whereabouts of any other frescoes into which Giotto has certainly introduced Dante. We must, however, bear in mind that Signor Carrà's subject, like Sir Sidney Colvin's, is not Dante but Giotto, and that he is not open to censure for believing what so many Dantists have told him.

Dante's one and only mention of Giotto is in a line which, however familiar, cannot be fully understood without a careful consideration of its context. Virgil and Dante are climbing the Mountain. They have reached the first cornice where the sin of pride is chastened. A penitent soul—once Oderisi of Agobbio and an illuminator of manuscripts—recognises Dante. Dante greets him more than once as the honour of his birthplace. That word 'honour' moves Oderisi to enlarge on its vanity. Worldly fame and honour are, he says, fleeting as the wind. Of this he himself is an example. His work had not been without its meed of praise. But Franco Bolognese 'has all the honour now.' His own was evanescent. Dante, after thus rescuing two

\* 'Dantologia,' p. 72. 'Giotto pittore è ricordato con lode.'

† 'Giotto,' by Carlo Carrà, London, 1925.



lowly artists from oblivion, makes Oderisi go on to augur a like fate for two other artists who were destined to be of more lasting fame. These are his words, or Long-fellow's translation of them :

'In painting Cimabue thought that he  
Should hold the field, now Giotto has the cry,  
So that the other's fame is growing dim.  
So has one Guido from the other taken  
The glory of our tongue, and he, perchance,  
Is born, who from the nest shall chase them both.  
Naught is this mundane rumour but a breath  
Of wind, that comes now this way and now that,  
And changes name, because it changes side.'\*

Fame is but a passing breath, an ever-shifting breeze which changes its name—a north wind or a south wind—as, in its fickleness, it blows now from one point and now again from another. The two Guidi are, no doubt, Guido Guinicelli (†1276) and Guido Cavalcanti (†1300). The third poet who 'perchance' is already 'born' may, perhaps, be Dante himself, but this is conjectural.

Are these lines an eulogy or a dyslogy or neither? If an eulogy we cannot but agree with Signor Carrà that, on the only occasion on which Dante makes mention of Giotto, the poet's strong friendship has not induced him to exaggerate his praise. But the burden of the whole passage is that, after all, the names he commemorates were writ in water. If, however, Cavalcanti was one of the two Guidi, Dante's triads are not inconsistent with friendship, for Guido Cavalcanti was the 'first' of Dante's friends and apparently his constant companion.† If, however, we knew no more of Cimabue and Giotto than Dante tells us in these frigid lines we should dismiss them from our thought as promptly as we dismiss the two forgotten illuminators and the two minor poets. Our footnote would be, 'Evidently two painters of some repute in their day who in turn rode for a moment on the crest of a wave of fashion and were soon lost in its trough.' What Giotto thought of this faint praise we can but guess. On our minds it leaves the

\* 'Purgatorio,' xi, 94.

† 'Vita Nuova,' III (primo de' miei amici'), and 'Inferno,' x, 60.

impression that Dante did not see the greatness of Giotto or foresee that after the lapse of centuries the glory of his great contemporary would be second only to his own.

In Dante's earlier days he and Giotto must often have met. That they were comparative strangers to one another was, it must be admitted, extremely unlikely; but we must not forget Archdeacon Paley's sagacious reminder that it is likely that unlikely things will happen. We have no direct evidence, but Florence, if judged by modern standards, was a small and compact city, and friends and foes must often have jostled one another in her narrow thoroughfares. Its literary and artistic circles freely intermingled. So we have been informed, but who knows anything of the artistic circles of Florence in the last quarter of the 13th century? Some sceptics have even hinted a doubt whether Cimabue's circle ever had a centre and, in spite of Dante's line, are inclined to regard him as a legendary figure. Such scepticism, though unwarranted, is a sufficient proof that his circle was not very clearly defined. Concerning Giotto's circle in his youth and early manhood we are almost equally in the dark. On the other hand, we know a good deal of Dante's circle, which was not only literary but also aristocratic. Brunetto Latini hardly counts. He was old when Dante was young and, Dante's filial affection notwithstanding, cannot have been too discriminating in his choice of associates. But Guido Cavalcanti and Forese Donati are in a different category. They were members of no mean families. Ugolino de' Visconti da Pisa ('Giudice Ningentil') was a potentate in Tuscany and Sardinia. Charles Martel was a titular king. Dante believed that the friendship, or rather the warm personal love, of Forese Donati and these other two men was abiding and strong enough to outlive death which had only purified and quickened it. Of Beatrice we know too little to dogmatise, but she and the other ladies of the 'Vita Nuova' apparently moved among what we may call the best society in Florence. Giotto, the peasant's son and the painter's apprentice, may have been a welcome guest at the tables of the great. Dante and he were neighbours. So were Milton and Vandyke. Genius does not always attract genius. 'Intra dissimili

amistà esser non possa.'\* Between the unlike, friendship cannot be. But we can only guess. We have no direct contemporary evidence, and of guesses founded upon guesses there has been an abundant supply.

The two Florentines may have met in Rome during the papal jubilee at the end of the 13th century. On this, as on much else concerning them, we are free to believe as our fancy pleases and to defy the adversary to prove that we are in the wrong.

Until lately no one doubted that Dante and Giotto met in Padua in 1306, and, as we have seen, Sir Sidney Colvin has told us that one was the guest of the other. That a certain Florentine—Dantino Alighieri by name—was in Padua on Aug. 27, 1306, is attested by a well-known legal document, and, naturally enough, eager Dantists have asked who could he be if not the poet. But a second, or even a third, Dante Alighieri has been unearthed. A man of that name was alive in Verona a score or so of years after our poet's death, and he, or a namesake, was in Padua about the year 1360. We now indeed hear that there were at least two families of Alighieri in Florence—one of bankers and the other of notaries and judges. The Christian name 'Dante' was of course common enough. Filippini says that he has found half a score of Dantes from Florence who were living in Bologna at or about the same time—honest men and rogues as he flippantly adds ('in piccolo spazio di tempo . . . una decina di Danti fiorentini tra galantuomini e ladri'). Filippini remarks that on the constitution of the Alighieri family the doubts are infinite.†

That further research may remove some of these doubts is not impossible. It may be observed in passing that, in 1902, Signor Dorini published a deed which, if genuine, proves that Dante was affianced to his wife, Gemma Donati, in the year 1277,‡ and that the dower was two hundred *lire*. In times of trouble, politics and other entanglements have often led to early marriages; and this document tends to corroborate Boccaccio's

† 'Convivio,' III, 1.

† 'Giornale Dantesco,' xxv, 88 (1922).

‡ 'Bulletino della Società Dantesca Italiana,' April and May, 1902, p. 184. Signor Barbi accepts this document as genuine. 'Studi Danteschi,' 1922, vol. v, p. 15.

often questioned statement that Dante's marriage was arranged for him by his friends. It has always been taken for granted that Dante did not marry until a few years after the death of Beatrice in 1290—when Dante was, we may assume, old enough to judge for himself; but it is unlikely that, precocious as the orphan lad may have been, he was allowed to choose his bride at the mature age of twelve. This has nothing to do with Giotto: it may, however, upset not a few paragraphs that have been written on Dante and Beatrice.

Further research may also throw light on Giotto's whereabouts in August 1306. Was he in Padua then? Some say that he was not. The Arena chapel was consecrated in March 1305, and Giotto, we are asked to believe, must have finished his work in it by that date. The inference seems precarious. Many buildings have been consecrated first and decorated afterwards. Dr van Marle says of the Padua frescoes, 'the fact is that we do not know at all with certainty when they were made.'\* The story of a certain conversation between Dante and Giotto concerning the ugliness of the artist's children counts for nothing. It was old in their day. Dante may have watched Giotto at work in Padua and, as some have rashly suggested, told him how to paint. But perhaps Dante would have 'somewhat grimly smiled' at a good many of our random fancies.

Both men were great travellers—Giotto as a successful artist and Dante (at least for a time) as a mendicant (*quasi mendicando*). Their paths may now and then have crossed, but, as Mr Holbrook admonished us years ago, we have no evidence except the Bargello portrait and Benvenuto d'Imola's Commentary that these two remarkable contemporaries were acquainted. Benvenuto's Commentary was 'published' in 1379, when Dante had been in his tomb for nearly sixty years.

Giotto was architect, sculptor, and painter. What does Dante tell us of the architecture, sculpture and painting of his time? What was his interest in the plastic arts in general, and more particularly in the work of Giotto?

---

\* 'The Development of the Italian Schools of Painting,' by Raimund van Marle, III, 49, The Hague, 1924.

'Raphael made a century of Sonnets,' and on the first anniversary of the death of Beatrice, 'Dante once prepared to paint an angel' \* It would be rash to conclude that the artist was a poet in words or that the poet was, as some have inferred from a possibly unique occasion, an artist in line and colour.

Of any impression that architecture may have made on him, Dante tells us nothing. According to Villani, and Villani is trustworthy, he visited Paris, and must have seen Notre Dame and the Sainte Chapelle—to say nothing of other glories of the new French Gothic—a new style as beautiful in stone as was his own *dolce stil nuovo* in verse. During his much wandering in Italy he must have seen some remains of the grandeur of Imperial Rome. Gothic cathedrals may not have appealed to his Italian or Latin taste, but on both Gothic and classic architecture alike he is silent.†

Of sculpture Dante makes abundant use in two cantos of the 'Purgatorio.'‡ On the cornice where Oderisi is expiating his pride were many sculptured figures. The rocky floor on which Dante and Virgil walk is paved with slabs inwrought with carved imagery of the proud. These memorials remind Dante of what he had seen in many a church. As, that some memory may exist of them,

'Above the buried dead their tombs on earth  
Bear sculptured on them what they were before.'

Thus the two poets, as they pass, see many mementoes of the proud of old—mementoes which the souls on the first cornice are compelled to contemplate as they stoop beneath their crushing loads. Such monsters of pride, now fallen, are there as Lucifer, Briareus and the giants of ancient days. Niobe is there weeping for her children; and Saul as he fell in Gilboa; Rehoboam and Holofernes and proud Ilion, abject and debased.

Carved in white marble on the wall of the cornice were eminent examples of the humble and meek, and

---

\* 'Vita Nuova,' xxxv. Browning, 'One Word More.'

† It has been suggested that the caryatides of 'Purgatorio,' x, 130, were a reminiscence of Verona.

‡ 'Purgatorio,' x and xii.

Dante seems to have taken rich delight in describing them. In the Victoria and Albert Museum in London is an Annunciation—a relief in white marble from the Church of Santa Croce in Florence. This beautiful work is assigned by the Museum to (*circa*) the year 1300, and by its date reminds us of the fact that at the end of the 13th century sculpture was far in advance of painting. Dante may have seen this work. It may have suggested to him his own white marble relief of the Annunciation as he saw it on the Mount of Purgation :

‘The Angel, who came down to earth with tidings  
Of peace that had been wept for, many a year,  
And opened Heaven from its long interdict,  
In front of us appeared, so truthfully  
There sculptured in a gracious attitude,  
He did not seem an image that is silent.  
One would have sworn that he was saying “Ave,”  
For She was there in effigy portrayed  
Who turned the key to ope the exalted love  
And in her mien this language had impressed,  
“*Ecce ancilla Dei.*”’

King David was there, humbling himself to dance before the ark, attended by choirs so radiant with life that the onlooker was well-nigh impelled to exclaim, ‘Yes, they sing’; and we who read are compelled to think (a pardonable anachronism) of Luca della Robbia’s or Donatello’s singing boys. We ought, of course, to think, instead, of Niccola Pisano and to conclude that Dante was more familiar with his works or had been more deeply impressed by them than by anything he had seen that came from the pencil of Cimabue, Duccio, or Giotto. His praise of the celestial artist who wrought these wonders sounds to us like unstinted praise of the sculptor’s power to express life and death in marble. ‘Whoe’er,’ he asks :

‘Whoe’er of pencil master was or stile  
That could portray the shades and traits which there  
Would cause the subtle genius to admire?  
Dead seemed the dead, the living seemed alive.’

Dante must have keenly appreciated sculpture whether seen by him in France or Italy.



To pictorial art Dante seems to have been less sensitive. He makes no allusion to the mosaics of Ravenna and elsewhere, or to the stained glass windows of France. We must, however, remember that he was recounting his exploration of an unknown world, and that, like Defoe and Swift, he found that the familiar, the known and the commonplace often served him better. A piece of burning paper, smoking pitch, a gap in a hedge, a flock of sheep, were more to his purpose than the most splendid creations of genius. Now and then he takes us on a long journey—to Arles or Pola, to Cologne or the Low Countries; but as a rule and like the Bible, he prefers homely illustrations such as the simplest can depict to themselves. Few of his readers would have seen mosaics or stained glass. Many of us have, like Dante, seen a man threading a needle.

For the theology, the science and the philosophy of his day, Dante's writings are a treasure house. Once he dwells with sustained enthusiasm on sculpture. But beyond a passing mention of Cimabue and Giotto—a mention which, as we have already said, strikes us as anything but enthusiastic—he is silent on painting; and his silence demands explanation.

The formal, traditional, hieratic pictures, the ecclesiastical madonnas and saints, which were all that he could have seen in his youth, may have left him unmoved. But the author of the 'Vita Nuova' and the 'Divina Commedia' knew perfectly well what he himself was doing in literature. He knew that by the spontaneity and inward impulse of his genius he was soaring high above his brother poets. He may not have asked whether ages to come would say of him that he had written of earth and heaven as no other man born of woman has ever written or ever can write. To us of to-day, he, like his own Mount of Purgation, towers aloof—unique, unparalleled, inimitable. There were 'Giotteschi.' There have been no 'Danteschi' worthy of the name. Dante was not, like Giotto, the founder of a school. Nevertheless he was, and knew that he was, a pioneer.

In any survey of modern art and letters, Niccola Pisano, Dante, and Giotto must alike be regarded as inaugurating a new era, and Giotto was doing for paint-

ing what Niccola Pisano had done for sculpture and Dante was doing for poetry. Like them he was breaking away from the frigid and formal and from the traditions of the past. How came it that Dante took no note or gave us no note of what was so great an advance in pictorial art? Did he resent it as so many resented the innovations of the pre-Raphaelites? Was he blind to the genius of Giotto? Did he never at Padua linger in awe and tears before that Mother bending over the body of her Son while angels gaze in wonder at the ineffable mystery of her sorrow?

The structure of the 'Divina Commedia' precludes architecture. To a hypercritic, even the white marbles of the 'Purgatorio' might seem out of place on a rough and craggy mountain. He would, perhaps, rather have seen them adorning a temple—a Catholic Parthenon. But the worlds beyond the grave, as Dante imagined them, offered no site for temple or church. His Hell is a subterranean quarry, vast, murky and worshipless. His Purgatory is of the open air and clear sky. At its foot waves ripple and rushes sway. A forest crowns it, watered by the streams of the Earthly Paradise. The stars appear; as the light fades contrite souls sing their vesper chant and angels make speed to ward off the nightly foe. The church penitent worships beneath the naked heavens. Dante's eternal Paradise is all motion, music and pure white radiance. The River of Light and the Everlasting Rose are as incorporeal as the angels—those Intelligences separate from matter—who minister; and as the redeemed who rejoice, triumphing in their crown. Dante saw no temple therein, for Heaven is not the finite palace of a Great King; it is the infinite Universe of God where time and space are not and where earth's noblest buildings would be but as a grain of sand in a boundless ocean. 'Ogni dove in Cielo è Paradiso.' Everywhere in Heaven is Paradise.

If Dante's conceptions, as unfolded in the 'Divina Commedia,' precluded architecture, they did not, as we have seen, altogether preclude sculpture? Why, then, did the most picturesque of poets ignore the art of the painter, and more especially the art of Giotto? Can it be that he was not familiar with the works of his great contemporary and had seen no pictures worthy of comparison

with the sculptured figures of the Pisani? Such a supposition would explain his silence, but it flies in the face of all tradition and of all established belief. Is it altogether incredible? Much that not long ago was confidently attributed to Giotto is now almost or quite as confidently attributed to the 'Giotteschi'—to his school. His disciples, we are told, worked at Assisi and Florence, and in those cities we see, so it is now said, the master's influence but not the master's hand. Padua is left to us. And this brings us back to the earlier questions. Did Dante visit Padua? Did he meet Giotto there? Did he see the frescoes in the Arena Chapel? If Giotto had 'the cry,' did that cry reach Dante only from a distance, too faint to provoke a glowing tribute? To such questions no dogmatic answer can be given, but we have to confront the startling possibility that Dante's apparent indifference to Giotto may have been based on ignorance or rather on lack of opportunity of seeing his work.

Was Dante the man to make many friends or to make them easily? He had forsworn all party ties and stood, he declares, 'foursquare.' Men who stand thus towerlike often stand alone.

That Dante and Giotto differed in genius is obvious but not apposite. It is the prerogative of genius to be unique, *sui generis*, unlike all others. In spite of Dante's saying that between the unlike there cannot be friendship, in the magnetism of the soul as in terrestrial magnetism it may be the unlike that attracts. Charles Lamb and Wordsworth were unlike. So were Mr and Mrs Browning.

Genius may be complementary to genius. Was it so with Giotto and Dante? Giotto, it need hardly be said, is human, or, better still, intensely humane. He accepts the gospel story and the legends of his day with simple faith. He asks no questions. It is his business to give a plain man's history of the Birth and of the human events that preceded and followed it. He ends with a last judgment which also is human in its weal and woe.

Giotto brings down to earth the Love which moves human hearts. Dante raises us to the Love which moves the sun and other stars.

Giotto gives us abundant rest. His angels hover.

Dante's have the speed of light. Giotto's shepherd sleeps. His figures do not move or, as in the Triumphal Entry, hardly seem to move.

Dante is for ever in motion. Lessing found his illustrations of 'progressive action' in the 'Iliad.' The 'Divina Commedia' would have served his purpose equally well; for neither Homer nor Dante tries to make us see a whole by a mechanical enumeration of its parts. Dante never rests. Haste, he wrote, is the enemy of dignity, but he is often in haste. Whatever his speed, he takes us with him. He does not describe. He makes us see for ourselves. He makes us look upwards to the morning star and downwards to the waters quivering in the faint light of early dawn. Our feet must follow his feet. Our eyes must follow his eyes. In the 'Inferno' he gives us no rest. In the 'Purgatorio,' resting-places are few, and if we pause for a moment to listen to Casella, we are soon compelled to follow Virgil and Dante in their hasty (we had almost written 'schoolboy') flight. In the 'Paradiso' no resting-place is needed. All is in motion and at peace like the eternal motion of the spheres. But with Dante as our leader we need to be alert or we lose.

Giotto has the unquestioning mind of the artist. Dante has the questioning mind of the student—interrogative and exploratory. He sought for knowledge as for fine gold, for knowledge is the final perfection and felicity of the soul ('la scienza è l'ultima perfezione della nostra anima nella quale sta la nostra ultima felicità' \*). His business is the quest of knowledge or, if of salvation, of salvation through perfect knowledge. He would solve mysteries, and if in his Vision we have little of the Atonement, we are perhaps justified in assuming that he accepted the theory of his day concerning the Atonement as adequate and satisfactory—as a problem that had been already solved. On the other hand, the Incarnation and the Trinity were transcendent mysteries to be pondered over in solitude. He must have been much alone in his studies and in his intense thoughts. He stands alone when he attains his soul's desire—the Beatific Vision. His guides have left him. Beatrice has

---

\* 'Convivio,' I, 1.

retaken her place among the multitudinous ranks of the Church Triumphant; and if she still smiles, it is from 'so far away.' St Bernard is lost to sight. Dante is alone when he finds the key to the infinite wonders of Deity. He does not enter into fellowship with the Father and with the Son and with the Holy Ghost. The lonely exile from Florence, the lonely wanderer in the dark valley is alone in highest Heaven. He has become the Eternal Solitary—beholding the Godhead but not one with God—satisfied, but alone.

In their fortunes as in their genius the two men widely differed. Giotto prospered. He had a home. In the fullness of years and honour he was buried in his own city. Dante's days were fewer and many of them were evil. He found many cities of refuge. Did he often find a home? His very tomb is alone, near where he heard the wind sighing through the pines; and his Florence, like his Beatrice, smiles from 'so far away.' Had he many friends? Was Giotto one of them?

W. J. PAYLING WRIGHT.

# Art. 8.—THE RULE OF LAW.

THE modern theory of the absolute sovereignty of Parliament is as inimical to the interests of the United Kingdom as it is to those of the British Empire and of International relations. In the struggle between King and Parliament in the 17th century the theory of the Divine Right of Kings was supplanted by that of the Supremacy of Parliament. The former had been propounded in order to meet the claims of Papal supremacy, and it may be, as has been said, that 'a doctrine of sovereignty vested by Divine Right in the King was the indispensable handmaiden of a national Reformation.'\* The insistence on this doctrine by the Stuarts led to the dissolution of the Tudor 'organic state,' which was so clearly defined by Henry VIII himself when he declared to Parliament 'we at no time stand so high in our estate royal as in time of parliament; when we as head and you as members are conjoined and knit together into one body politic.'† In this 'body politic' King and People were regarded as component parts, each dependent on the other, although the King was recognised by the People as the proper centre of the commonwealth. With the claim of the Stuarts to absolutism these component parts inevitably flew apart. The bond between them was irretrievably shattered. But just as the Tudors had no intention of establishing the theory of Divine Right, so the Parliamentarians had no intention of establishing Parliamentary supremacy. They had no intention of substituting for a King *legibus solutus* a Parliament equally *legibus solutum*. No doubt this was the inevitable consequence of their action, but the fact was established long before the theory found expression. The fact was established by the Declaration of Parliament of May 27, 1642, in answer to the King's Proclamation forbidding his subjects to obey the Parliament's order for mustering the militia. 'By this memorable declaration,' says Mr John Allen, 'they assumed to themselves the supreme power of the State, retaining nothing of monarchy but the name.'‡ The theory, however, of legislative supremacy was only fully developed by Bentham and

\* Figgis, 'Divine Right of Kings,' p. 92.

† 'Parl. Hist.,' vol. 1, p. 555.

‡ 'Royal Prerogative,' pp. 83-4.



his successor, Austin, and only generally accepted in the 19th century. The men who destroyed the theory of the Divine Right of Kings had no idea of surrendering the fundamental principles of the Constitution to Parliament. They were for the most part imbued with the traditional mediæval conception of a law superior to any sovereign power. It is true that under the Stuarts, both before and after the Civil War, the theory of legislative supremacy was asserted in the debates on Bills of Attainder and carried by small majorities in both houses. It is also true that it was upheld by Chief Justice Rolle in *Streater's Case*, during the Protectorate, but this was an abnormal period, and in later proceedings the Act or Order of Parliament was declared by the Court not to be a Judgment of Parliament. As Prof. Mellwaine justly observes, 'even after legislative sovereignty had become a generally accepted fact, the essential injustice of these Acts caused men to revolt.' It was aptly said in a debate in the House of Commons in 1675, 'when supremacy and impunity go together there is no remedy.' Whilst they bowed to the necessities of the time, they clearly perceived the danger of the theory. It was by insisting upon this theory, when its necessity had passed, that the New England Colonies were lost to the Empire. The Colonies were quite prepared to accept Self-Government under the Crown. This theory was also responsible for the Irish trouble. Dominion status was only granted when coercion and civil war had failed.

The full-blown theory of the omnipotence of the King in Parliament is quite modern—indeed it is scarcely a century old. Parliament, as the tag goes, can do anything except make a woman into a man. From the first the Whigs noted the weakness of the theory under which a majority in the House of Commons may impose its will upon the nation regardless of all considerations of existing rights. To-day a chance majority in the House of Commons, perhaps representing only a small minority in the country, has the power, according to this theory of Parliamentary omnipotence, to deprive the subject of all or any of his fundamental rights. And there is no appeal. To-day the judges deem themselves bound by the provisions of an Act of Parliament, however contrary they may be, to fundamental rights or natural justice.

This, as has been clearly demonstrated, was not always so, and to-day students of political science are getting away from the modern theory of absolute and undivided sovereignty of Kings and Parliaments, and returning to the mediæval conception of a law superior to either.

In Europe, as Maitland has shown, the idea of the absolute and undivided sovereignty of a ruling prince was incomprehensible to the mediæval mind. Double allegiance was universal. Above the ruling princes stood the Pope and the Emperor. And above and beyond them loomed the law—embracing not only divine law, but also the law of nature, *jus naturæ*, by which as some theologians taught even God Himself was bound. This doctrine was part of the legal heritage bequeathed to the world by Imperial Rome. Consequently, in England during this period and well on into the 17th century, the idea prevailed that there was a law superior to the ordinances of the King and to the statutes of Parliament. This idea was clearly stated by Bracton, one of Henry III's judges, who declared 'the King is below no man, but he is below God and the law';\* and in the 15th century Chief Justice Fortescue held that the King's power is not absolute, but is limited by law.

And the judges had a very clear conception of the nature of law. When in a case in 1345 it was said that law is the will of the judges, Chief Justice Stonore at once replied, '*Nayl, ley est resoun,*' 'Nay, Nay, law is reason.' And in 1435 we find Wampage, in default of something more authoritative than conflicting precedents, appealing to the maxim enunciated by Stonore, '*et Sir, le ley est fond de resoun, et ceo que resoun est ley.*' This is the phrase used by Coke when he said, 'Reason is the life of the law, nay, the common law itself is nothing but reason; which is to be understood of an artificial perfection of reason, gotten by long study, natural reason; for *Nemo nascitur artifex*. This legall reason is *summa ratio*. And therefore if all the reason that is dispersed into so many severall heads were united in one, yet could he not make such a law as the law of England is.' And in 1703, in the case of *Coggs v. Bernard*, we find Mr Justice Powell saying, 'Let us consider the

---

\* 'De Leg. et Cons. Ang.,' f. 171b.

reason of the case, for nothing is law that is not reason.' And in his judgment in the same case Chief Justice Holt constantly appeals to reason as the basis of the law. 'If the law be so,' he declares, 'there must be some just and honest reason for it.' Again, citing Bracton, he says it is true he is an old author, 'but his doctrine is agreeable to reason and to what the law is in other countries . . . his opinion is reasonable and very much to my present purpose and there is no authority to the contrary . . . it is supported by good reason and authority.'

What, then, did these lawyers mean by this word 'reason'? Was it pure justice or natural right or that 'legal reason' which Coke called the life of the law? These lawyers were not talking in the air. They were acute thinkers and practical men. It was Plato who defined the common law of Greece as 'that which being taken up by the common consent of the community is called law.' It was, he said in another place, 'the golden and sacred rule of reason which we call the common law.' This, said James Wilson in his inaugural address to the University of Pennsylvania in 1790 on the Common Law, 'shows the antiquity of the name; it teaches common law to be nothing but common reason—that refined reason which is generally received by the consent of all.' These lawyers appeal to the reason of common law, that is, the trained and enlightened reason, founded upon and directed by that reasoning of the ages of judicial decisions, by which the principle to be applied to the particular case is found and when found followed. And they refused to be bound by precedent, to do as others had done in like cases. If the precedent was contrary to reason, so much the worse for the precedent. *Coggs v. Bernard* is a good illustration. Bernard had undertaken to remove certain casks of brandy belonging to Coggs from one cellar to another without fee or reward. In the removal, by the negligence of Bernard or his servants, one of the casks was broken and the contents lost. Bernard was held liable for the loss. Counsel for Bernard relied upon *Southcote's Case*,\* decided in the reign of Elizabeth, according to which a gratuitous bailee was not liable for negligence. The

---

\* Cro. El. 815,

Court refused to be bound by this precedent, Holt, C.J., saying of this case 'there is neither reason nor authority.'

And in subsequent cases resulting from modern developments, the same reasoning has been applied. For instance, where the owner of a motor-car gratuitously carried a friend who by the negligence of the owner's driver was killed, the owner was held liable in damages. 'The principle,' said Collins, M.R., in an earlier case, 'in all cases of this class is that the care exercised must be reasonable and the standard of reasonableness naturally must vary according to the circumstances of the case, the trust reposed and the skill and appliances at the disposal of the person to whom another person confides a duty.\*' And in the recent case of *Howard Flander v. Malvern Corporation*, where the defendant had under its statutory powers removed a pavement to the injury of the plaintiff, it was held by the Divisional Court that such powers had been exercised unreasonably, since they had caused unnecessary injury.

The author of the 'Dialogue of the Doctor and Student' written in the 16th century classifies the law of England as 'The Law of God,' i.e. divine law; 'the Law of Man,' i.e. positive law; and 'the Law of Reason,' which last he defines as that 'which by the doctors is called the law of nature of reasonable creatures.' We are told that this term 'the law of nature' of the doctors of the Civil law was rejected by the common lawyers. By the law of reason we are told a man is protected in his personal and property rights. These laws of reason are derived from customs, maxims, and statutes, and when so derived are of higher authority than they. Thus a custom, maxim, or statute which is against reason is *ipso facto* void. Moreover, in the hands of the common lawyers this reason became identified with the fundamental principles of the Common Law, 'the artificial reason' which was regarded by Coke as sacred and unchangeable, which he termed 'the perfection of reason.' Nevertheless, it is hard to distinguish between this law of reason and the law of nature, and the author of the 'Dialogue' was unable to see any distinction. It seems tolerably clear that whatever term was used for this conception of a

\* *Harris v. Perry*, [1903] 2 K. B. 219.

superior law, whether the law of nature, reason, equity, or justice, these lawyers meant the same thing.

And they applied the same principle even to Acts of Parliament. It was asserted by Coke, C.J., in 1609, when he said 'the Common Law will control the Acts of Parliament and sometimes adjudge them to be utterly void; for where an Act of Parliament is against common right, or reason, or repugnant, or impossible to be performed, the Common Law will control it, and adjudge such Act to be void.'\* In his 'Observations on the Reports,' Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, who had been entrusted by James with the task of condemning Coke's 'Reports,' controverted this assertion, but from Serjeant Hill's copy of Ellesmere's 'Observations,' formerly in Lincoln's Inn Library, it appears that two of the judges agreed with Coke, and Hill's note that a statute against reason is void is supported by many authorities cited by him prior and subsequent to *Bonham's Case*. In 1615, for instance, it was declared by the Court of Common Pleas that an Act of Parliament made against natural equity, so as to make a man a judge in his own case, is void in itself, 'for *jura naturæ sunt immutabilia* and they are *leges legum*.'† Nearly a century later Chief Justice Holt declared that 'what my Lord Coke says in *Dr Bonham's Case* is far from extravagancy, for it is very reasonable and true saying that if an Act of Parliament should ordain the same person party and judge, or which is the same thing, judge in his own cause, it would be a void Act of Parliament. . . . An Act of Parliament may not make adultery lawful.'‡

In a case in 1744 Lord Mansfield, when Solicitor-General, said, in the course of his argument, 'a statute very seldom takes in all cases, therefore the Common Law that works itself pure by rules drawn from the fountain of justice, is for that reason superior to an Act of Parliament.' The Court, consisting of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, Lord Chief Justice Lee, Lord Justice Willes, and Lord Chief Justice Parker—a galaxy of legal talent—were of opinion that the depositions of witnesses of the Gentoo religion, sworn according to

\* *Bonham's Case*, 8 Rep. 118. † *Day v. Savage*, Hobart's Rep. 97.

‡ *City of London v. Wood*, 12 Mod. 669 (1701).

their ceremonies, ought in the special circumstances of the case to be read as evidence in the case. The defendant's counsel had argued that this was contrary to the statutes, which could only be altered by the legislature. On this point, Parker, C.B., said, referring to *Wells v. Williams*,\* where the Court allowed an alien enemy, commorant here by licence of the King, to sue, though this was contrary to the statute. 'The law of England is not confined to particular cases, but is more governed by reason than by any one case whatever.'†

This principle was successfully invoked as late as 1823. In *Stewart v. Lawton*, Serjeant Cross for the plaintiff relied on Coke's doctrine and solemnly argued upon it. It is quite clear that the plaintiff had not complied with the provisions of the statute, 8 Ann. c. 43, which was held by the Court to be still in force. The defendant's counsel relied upon the statute as fatal to the plaintiff's claim. This in the opinion of the Court would have worked an injustice. And so, whilst in effect treating the statute as void, it endeavoured to show that it could not have been the intention of Parliament to work such an injustice, and consequently the statute did not really apply. A lame conclusion by which, whilst justice was done, the direct issue was avoided.‡

It was not until 1871 that this principle was expressly rejected by the Courts. In a case where it was proved that two Private Acts of Parliament had been obtained by fraud, Mr Justice Willes said, 'I would observe as to these Acts of Parliament, that they are the law of the land; and we do not sit here as a court of appeal from Parliament. It was once said—I think by Hobart [in *Day v. Savage*]<sup>§</sup>—that if an Act of Parliament were to create a man a judge in his own case, the Court might disregard it. That dictum, however, stands as a warning, rather than an authority to be followed. We sit here as servants of the Crown and of the Legislature. Are we to act as regents over what is done by Parliament with the consent of the Crown, Lords, and Commons? I deny that any such authority exists. If an Act of Parliament has been obtained improperly, it is

\* 1 Ld. Raym. 282. † *Omychund v. Barker*, 1 Atkyn, at pp. 32-3.

‡ These last three cases were apparently unknown to Prof. McIlwaine.



for the Legislature to correct it by repealing it, but so long as it exists as law, the Courts are bound to obey it. The proceedings here are judicial, not autocratic, which they would be if we could make laws instead of administering them.\* It would appear, however, that the learned judge missed the point. To declare a law void because it is unconstitutional is not to make new law, but to maintain the old law. And in fact when the judges exercise their power to do equity—which they do every day—they do, in fact, make new law, however much they may pretend they are merely administering the existing law. Naturally, if third parties without notice of the fraud had acquired rights under the Acts, the Court would rightly recognise such rights.†

It is not without interest to note that the New England settlers, who carried with them across the Atlantic the English Common Law, retained and developed the mediæval conception enunciated by Coke. Long before Chief Justice Marshall in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), 1 Cranch, 137, declared an Act of Congress unconstitutional and consequently null and void, all Courts in the English settlements, whether they possessed written constitutions or not before the coming into force of the Constitution in 1789, claimed and exercised the right to declare a statute which was contrary to *jus nature* or to the fundamental rights of the citizen unconstitutional, and null and void. As instances of the exercise of this power prior to 1789 may be cited *Holmes v. Walton*, decided in 1780, in which a law of the State of New Jersey was declared unconstitutional (see 'Am. Hist. Rev.,' iv, 456); and in *Caton v. Commonwealth of Virginia* (1782), 4 Call. (Virginia) 5, Judge Wythe said, 'I have heard an English Chancellor who said, and it was nobly said, that it was his duty to protect the rights of the subject against the encroachments of the Crown; and that he would do it at every hazard.' Judge Wythe proceeded, 'Nay, more, if the whole legislature, an event to be deprecated, should attempt to overlap the bounds prescribed to them by the people, I, in administering the public justice of the country, will meet the united

\* *Lee v. Bude and Torrington Ry. Co.*, 6 C. P. at p. 582.

† See *Fletcher v. Peck*, 5 Cranch, 87 (1810).

powers at my seat in this tribunal; and pointing to the constitution, will say to them, here is the limit of your authority; and hither shall you go, but no further.'

In *Rutgers v. Waddington* (1784), Thayer's *Leading Cases*, 1. 63, the Mayor's Court of the City of New York refrained from expressly declaring a statute void, but in fact disregarded it. 'But when' it was said 'a law is expressed in general words and some collateral matter which happens to arise from those general words, is unreasonable, then the judges are in decency to conclude, that the consequences were not foreseen by the legislature; and therefore they are at liberty to expound the statute by equity and only *quoad hoc* to disregard it.' This passage is taken verbatim from Blackstone, *Intro.* § 3, par. 10, p. 107 (1813 Ed.). Subject to this limitation, Blackstone himself upheld the supremacy of Parliament. Rhode Island was under her original charter. In *Trevett v. Weeden* (1786), Chandler's *Am. Criminal Trials*, II, 269 (1844), an Act of the General Assembly had abolished trial by jury. On the ground that the right to trial by jury was a fundamental constitutional right the Court refused to take cognisance of the information. In a North Carolina case, *Bayard and Wife v. Singleton* (1787), 1 Martin (N.C.) 42, in declaring a statute unconstitutional the Court said, 'But that it was clear, that no Act they could pass, could by any means repeal or alter the constitution, because if they could do this they would at the same instant of time destroy their own existence as a Legislature and dissolve the government thereby established.\*' Consequently the constitution (which the judicial power was bound to take notice of as much as of any other law whatever), standing in full force as the fundamental law of the land, notwithstanding the Act on which the present motion was grounded, the same Act must, of course, in that instance stand as abrogated and without any effect.' This principle was embodied in the Constitution of 1787, and the Supreme Court created for the purpose of enforcing it. Thenceforth not only the Supreme Court,

---

\* This idea is derived from Vattel, who, in his 'Law of Nations,' says, 'It is from the Constitution that those legislators derive their power: how then can they change it without destroying their own authority?'

but all Courts, claimed and continued to exercise the right to declare statutes which were unconstitutional, and contrary to the fundamental rights of the citizens, null and void. The theory is that any Court may exercise the power of holding Acts invalid; in so doing it assumes no special and peculiar rôle; for it is the duty of a Court both to declare what the law is, and to apply it, and, also, not to recognise and apply what is not law; if a legislative Act is beyond legislative competence it cannot be law.

As already indicated, the real issue in the quarrel with the American Colonies was whether or not the Imperial Parliament was entitled to exercise unlimited authority throughout the Empire. The slogan 'No taxation without representation' only appeared in the last phase of the ten years' controversy which commenced in 1765. One man in England perceived the truth. In his maiden speech in the House of Lords in 1766 on the Declaratory Act, Lord Camden struck the true note when he declared that there are some things that Parliament cannot do. 'My Lord,' he said, 'he who disputes the authority of any supreme legislature treads on very tender ground. . . . In my opinion the legislature has no right to make this law. The sovereign authority, the omnipotence of the legislature, is a favourite doctrine, but there are some things they cannot do. They cannot enact anything against divine law . . . they cannot take away any man's private property without making him compensation. A proof of which is the many private bills, as well as public, passed every session. They have no right to condemn any man by bill of attainder without hearing him.' He was solemnly rebuked by Lord Chancellor Northington, who regaled the House with the old story of the *summum imperium* of Great Britain and the sovereignty of Parliament. 'With great submission to the noble and learned lord,' he said, 'I believe that all except himself will admit that every government can arbitrarily impose laws on all its subjects.' And thus the Tory majority snatched at the shadow and lost the substance.

On a subsequent occasion Lord Camden declared he had reviewed his argument and re-examined the authorities upon which it was based, and reiterated his contention that the Declaratory Act was 'absolutely

illegal, contrary to the fundamental laws of nature, contrary to the fundamental laws of the constitution.' 'Taxation and representation are,' he said, 'inseparable—this position is founded on the laws of nature; it is more; it is an eternal law of nature; for whatever is a man's own, is absolutely his own; no man has a right to take it from him, without his consent, either expressed by himself or representative; whoever attempts to do it, attempts an injury; whoever does it commits a robbery; he throws down and destroys the distinction between liberty and slavery. Taxation and representation are coeval with and essential to this constitution.'

Prof. McIlwaine is mistaken in stating that this was one last whisper of the old theory.\* Far from it. For instance, in the debate in the House of Commons on March 10, 1794, on the trial of Muir and Palmer, Mr Adam, a leading Scots advocate, in treating of the statute law of Scotland, declared it to be 'a singular feature of the law of that country that the effect and operation of statutes may be varied by usage, and that a series of judicial decisions will operate as a repeal of an Act of Parliament.'† And in the debate on sinecure offices on March 13, 1797, Pitt in opposing the motion for their reduction declared that they were in the nature of a feudal tenure. 'Parliament,' he said, 'has expressly said they will respect them as freehold property; and if in answer to this solemn declaration, it is urged that parliament may rescind its former resolutions, I say they may by parity of reasoning destroy every kind of property in the Kingdom. But to dwell any longer on this kind of argument would be too absurd to merit attention; and I have only to observe that we ought not to lose sight, even for an instant, of those grand principles which lead to and are inseparable from the administration of public justice.'‡

Again, in the debate on the Irish Union in the Commons on May 7, 1800, the Earl of Carnarvon in protesting against the creation of a body of elective Irish peers, declared that the hereditary principle was part of the Constitution. 'I have heard much,' he said,

\* 'High Court of Parliament,' p. 309.

† 'Parl. Hist.,' vol. 30, 1507.

‡ Ibid., vol. 33, 87.

'of the omnipotence of Parliament; I respect it and venerate its power, from wherever its security is derived; its limits, if it has any, should not be made the topic of discussion, because it is of difficult and dangerous definition, but this attempt will force the inquiry; it is not easy to support the affirmative or the negative as a universal proposition in an assertion that Parliament is competent to make any change whatever; I cannot deny that many important changes may be made, and that such power is of the essence of Parliament, without which it would be nugatory, but I am not ready to admit as a corollary that there is no immutable basis on which the liberties of this country are fundamentally fixed beyond the reach of the delegated power of Parliament. I can, however, boldly affirm that there is no existing power which can by its legal authority extirpate the fundamental principles of the three orders of the State, which may not by the same legal authority and under the same influence, surrender the whole existence of both branches of the legislature and the liberties of the people at the foot of the throne.'\*

I am not here concerned with the apparently insoluble problem of where the sovereign power resides. The theory of Bryce and Dicey that the legal sovereignty lies with the King in Parliament, and the political sovereignty with the electorate, is rejected by Prof. Mcllwaine and Dr R. G. Adams. Rightly so, since if the King in Parliament, i.e. the Government, is merely the agent of the community, which it undoubtedly is, it cannot be sovereign, whatever legal powers it may otherwise possess. But whether sovereignty resides in the Government; or in Parliament and the Electorate, as Austin taught; or in the Electorate; or in the people at large, as Ritchie thought, such sovereignty is limited by law. Both T. H. Green and Willoughby sought to limit the term 'sovereignty' to its purely legal application. The term should be reserved for the legal sovereignty of the legislature. 'The value,' says the latter, 'of constitutional government is not that it places

---

\* 'Parl. Hist.,' vol. 35, 174. The doctrine which the argument is used to support is of course absurd. The three estates are not fundamental principles of the Constitution. The argument that Parliament is not competent to do what it likes is the point of interest.

sovereignty in the hands of the people, but that it prescribes definite ways in which this sovereign power shall be exercised by the State,' i.e. by the Government.

The outstanding contribution to political theory made by the thinkers of the American Revolution was the application of the mediæval conception of a law superior to all human institutions. They framed their Constitution in such a way as to ground it upon the doctrine of the sovereignty of law. They solved the problem of mediating between the idea of an absolutely independent and an absolutely subject State by recognising the existence of a sovereign law to which each was subject, and they placed the power of enforcing this law in the Courts. They believed in the existence of the law of nature of which both constitutional law and the law of nations were branches. And so they embodied both in the Constitution. By the law of the Constitution the fundamental rights of the individual to his life, his liberty, and his property were protected. By the law of nations the rights of States *inter se* were regulated. Both had been received by civilised communities, and, as Gierke puts it, both partook of 'the immutability and sanctity of natural law.' The Republic was what Harrington taught John Adams to think of as 'an empire of laws and not of men.' In such an Empire, says Dr R. G. Adams, 'principle, not people, was sovereign by definition.'\*

The Americans appealed to the principles of the British Constitution, which they conceived to be similar. British statesmen, however, in their folly adhered to the new theory of legislative supremacy, which had outgrown its utility. Subsequently, they adopted in practice the division of authority for which the Americans had contended. But to this day they adhere to the new theory of legislative supremacy, which in the case of the Dominions they would not dare to enforce. 'A federal empire,' says Prof. Mellwaine, 'composed of powerful States cannot long be held together by mere forbearance. It is unreasonable to expect fair weather all the time, and such a federation is likely to be shattered by the first severe storm.'† Since these words were written

---

\* 'Political Ideas of the American Revolution,' c. VIII.

† 'High Court of Parliament,' 387.



the British Empire has experienced the severest storm in its existence. But it came from without. Next time it may conceivably come from within. No quarrels are more bitter than those within the family.

Maitland at least perceived the danger. 'Some friendly critics,' he wrote, 'would say that in the past we could afford to accept speciously logical, but brittle theories, because we knew that they would never be subjected to serious strain. Some would warn us that in the future the less we say about a supra-legal, supra-jural plenitude of power concentrated at a single point at Westminster—concentrated in a single organ of an increasingly complex commonwealth—the better for that commonwealth may be the days that are coming.'\* Elsewhere, he says, 'thinking of the complex and loosely-knit British Commonwealth, we cannot look into the future without serious misgivings. If unity of law—such unity as there has been—disappears, much else that we treasure will disappear also, and (to speak frankly) unity of law is precarious. The power of the parliament of the United Kingdom to legislate for the colonies is fast receding into the ghostly company of legal fictions.'†

Assuming, however, that complete legislative power were granted to the Dominion legislatures the problem would still remain whether they in their turn were limited by law or not. In fact, the same problem arises in the case of any government. The danger to the fundamental rights of the individual by the exercise of legislative power is far from illusory. One of the new Succession States on the Continent has already expropriated the landowners without any compensation whatever, and many others have done so with merely derisory compensation. Even in Great Britain a labour leader has supported the right to commandeer the spare bedrooms of the bourgeoisie for the use of the working classes. And in the United States the exemption from income tax of all incomes under 1000*l.* a year is now advocated. Under modern conditions this means that the minority, which carries the burden, is outvoted by the majority, which gets the plunder.

---

\* 'Gierke's Political Theories of the Middle Ages,' p. xlviii.

† 'English Law and the Renaissance,' p. 33.

In the American Constitution de Tocqueville clearly perceived a century ago the danger of majority rule. 'I rest the origin,' he said, 'of all powers on the will of the people, and yet I regard as impious and detestable, the maxim that the majority have a right to do what they think best—how is all this? Do I not contradict myself? No; for there is general law, which has been adopted, not only by the majority of the people, but by the majority of the human race; and this law is the law of justice. It is justice, then, that forms the boundary of the right of every people to do what they choose. A nation is like a jury of the human race, and is to apply the law by which it is bound—the law of justice. When I refuse, then, to obey an unjust law, I appeal from the sovereignty of the people to the sovereignty of the human race.' And he goes on to say, 'When I see a right and a faculty allowed to any power, be it what it may, to do whatever it chooses, be it called people, or king, democracy or aristocracy, whether exercised under a monarchy or under a republic, then I say, there is the germ of tyranny, and for my part I will look for another system of laws under which to live.'

Finally, he defines his ideal of a democratic government. 'Suppose now, on the contrary that you have a legislature, composed in such a manner that it shall represent the majority, but not necessarily be the slave of its passions; an executive power, that shall have a force assigned to it; a judiciary power independent of both. You will then have a government, democratic indeed, but you will no longer have such grounds to expect tyranny.' 'If liberty is ever to be lost in America, the cause will be the domination of the majority, which will hurry minorities into despair, and make them appeal to force. Anarchy will ensue, but an anarchy the result of despotism.' And even Jefferson, the great apostle of democracy, and opponent of the Federalists, the founders of the Constitution, also perceived the danger when he said, 'The executive power in our government, is not the sole, nor even perhaps the principal object of my anxiety; the tyranny of our legislature is now, and will for some years be, a danger far more formidable: that of the executive power will come in its turn, but at a far distant period.'

These views are again finding expression in the United States. An attorney in St Louis, in declining to become a member of the American Peace Society, wrote last year, 'A settled distrust of government in the people is the first requisite to peace and liberty. Governments must be bound down against the power to harm the citizen nationally and internationally; we did it nationally, but it must be done over and over again. We have already slipped back into absolutism; that is to say, the politician—the political power holder—constantly reaching out for more power, has transformed ours into practically an *unlimited government*. . . . In our internal concerns we have learned—and forgotten—how to protect ourselves against some forms of arbitrary power by the imposition of prohibitions upon government. These must be enlarged and extended to international concerns.'

Prof. Burgess is equally alarmed by the growth of autocracy in the United States, the inception of which he dates from the Spanish-American War of 1898. There now remains, he asserts, hardly an immunity against governmental power which may not be set aside by government, at its own will and discretion, with or without reason, as government itself may determine. In short, the government of the United States is now in principle autocratic. Whether and when it may become such in practice now depends entirely upon the discretion of the governmental authorities. Thus the distinction between sovereignty and government has been lost. The old principle upon which the Constitution is based, viz. that government in the United States is 'a government of laws not men,' is disregarded. Everywhere the cry is raised for more government. Prompt and drastic remedies for every conceived ill are the order of the day. The fundamental rights of the individual lie at the mercy of the government. That crowning feature of American public law, the system of constitutional immunity against governmental autocracy, protected by an independent judiciary, has in practice disappeared.\*

In a paper published in 1915,† Dr Baty called attention to the spirit of domination which permeates the

---

\* 'Recent Changes in American Constitutional Theory' (1923).

† 'Bellicist Theory of State Structure.'

whole of our State structure. 'Everywhere,' he wrote, 'the dogma of an omnipotent, coercive, dominating assembly of some kind or other is assumed as the basic axiom of politics. There may be a constitution, but some constituent assembly is definitely contemplated as invested with power to alter it and install itself as dictator.' Certain principles, he admits, are enshrined beyond the reach of ordinary legislation in the American Constitution, but even these do not constitute a permanent bulwark, since they may—with great difficulty no doubt—be altered by Congress.

The complacency with which this dogma of legislative omnipotence was generally regarded received a rude shock from the emergency measures introduced during the late war. Most of these measures were entirely unnecessary, since ample powers were conferred upon the authorities by the Common Law. By the first Defence of the Realm Act, in spite of the fact that the Courts were sitting—and they continued to sit throughout the war—the citizen was deprived of his right to trial by Judge and Jury, and might be tried for his life by a Court-martial. It is true that this right was restored nine months later by the action of a few Law Lords in the House of Lords. Moreover, a number of Regulations, issued under the Defence Acts, were *ultra vires*, some being subsequently withdrawn, or declared void by the Courts. These restrictions upon the liberty of the subject were philosophically borne by the public, which was only too anxious to assist the Government in the war, but the public was nevertheless quick to perceive by what a slender thread the hardworn liberties of the subject hung. Parliament had betrayed its trust and the House of Commons had ceased to be guardian of the fundamental principles of the Constitution. The stock of the political leaders sank to zero. The guilt had worn off the ginger-bread. It was perceived that the country was really at the mercy of a bureaucratic machine, which interfered in everything and controlled everything; run partly by permanent departmental officials and partly by party leaders, who came and went. As Dr Baty points out, the people cannot possibly exercise any effective check and control over their representatives in the Commons, and the Commons can exercise no

effective control over what is ironically called 'their Committee'—the Cabinet. The party system is a reciprocating engine which drives the coach of State over all obstacles. The bulk of the legislation passed in any session of Parliament is not legislation in which the country takes the slightest interest. It is legislation which the government departments want, and which the party leaders are willing to give them.

In the United States during the late war emergency legislation similar in character to that in Great Britain was passed. This was enforced with even greater harshness than in Great Britain. In the treatment of conscientious objectors, for instance, Americans went far beyond the necessity of the case, but it was typical of the modern American idea of majority rule. Prior to the Civil War the Supreme Court had not only protected the fundamental principles of the Constitution but, inspired by Chief Justice Marshall, solved many of the commercial problems, thus acting as the safety-valve of the political machine. After that event, however, the Court fell under the same big business interests as those which controlled Congress, and although it continued to protect the Constitution, it failed to solve the industrial and social problems presented to it. To-day the personnel of the Court is changing, and Americans are looking for relief not to Congress, which they regard as both incompetent to deal with the complexity of industrial and social reforms, and too self-interested, but to the Supreme Court.

Recently Mr A. T. Hadley, President Emeritus of Yale University, has drawn attention to the misuse of legislative authority in the United States. A mass of enactments, he complains, is produced by the system of log-rolling. Measures are passed in the interests of this or that group of legislators, which are unsupported by a general public opinion. The true conception, he contends, is that of the legislator as a trustee. 'It is only by acceptance of the principle of official trusteeship that the world or any part of it,' he declares, 'can be made safe for democracy.' But this conception, in my view, is insufficient. Moreover, as already stated, the problems of modern civilisation are too vast and complex for any one authority to deal with. One solution, no doubt,

is decentralisation, leaving the groups affected to find the remedy. The world will never be made safe for democracy until democracy itself is made subject to the law. And in an address delivered in New York on Jan. 20, 1926, upon the anniversary of John Marshall's appointment as Chief Justice, Mr Albert C. Ritchie, Governor of Maryland, attacked the growing centralisation of power in the Federal Government. This, he said, was making a situation in which growing disrespect for the law might break down the American legal system. He declared that if Marshall had been alive he would have saved American institutions from the dangers which imperilled them.

It is a mistake to suppose that the exercise of judicial power is peculiar to a federal system under a written constitution. It did not exist in the former German Constitution; nor does it in the Swiss Constitution. By the new German Constitution conflicts between a state and the federation may be referred to the Supreme Federal Court, but there is no provision conferring power upon the Court to interpret the Constitution. On the other hand, although in the United Kingdom we do not possess a written Constitution the fundamental rights of the individual are clearly defined and established by the Common Law, and are declared in such national conventions as Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, and the Bill of Rights. Consequently, it is just as easy for the Courts to protect such fundamental rights as if they were embodied in a written Constitution.

At the gathering of the American Bar Association in Westminster Hall on July 21, 1924, Secretary Hughes made it abundantly clear that the Common Law, or rather the spirit of the Common Law, was the guardian of their political and civil rights. This spirit, he said, 'is opposed to those insidious encroachments upon liberty which take the form of an uncontrolled administrative authority. . . . We have an instinctive feeling that there is no panacea for modern ills in bureaucracy. There is still the need to recognise the ancient right—and it is the most precious right of democracy—the right to be governed by law and not by officials—the right to reasonable, definite, and proclaimed standards which the citizen can invoke against malevolence and



caprice.' It was true this protection of fundamental rights was put into the written Constitution—rights deemed to be beyond the reach of the legislature—but the conception of limited powers given to the Government is directly traceable to the principles of the Common Law. This distinctive feature of their legal system was a heritage from a past held in common. The American Constitution guaranteed that no one should be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. 'It did not refuse to the Legislatures the authority to enact reasonable measures . . . but it was intended to preserve and enforce the primary and fundamental conceptions of justice which demand notice and opportunity to be heard in advance of condemnation, and with respect to every department of Government freedom from arbitrariness.' And in paying this tribute to the spirit of Common Law, Secretary Hughes emphasised the necessity for a fearless and independent judiciary, competent and impartial, upholding the supremacy of the law.

In all countries, therefore, where the Parliamentary system prevails, it would appear to be on its trial. In some countries we see minorities imposing their will on the general public by methods of log-rolling. In other countries we see majorities riding roughshod over the fundamental rights of minorities. Everywhere the result is the same, a growing contempt for all law. The solution for over-legislation would appear to be decentralisation, leaving each group and interest to manage its own affairs, of which it alone possesses the necessary knowledge. The remedy for majority rule is to be found in an independent judiciary endowed with power to protect the fundamental rights of the individual. Both these solutions demand the recognition of the divisibility of sovereignty, and of a law which is superior to kings and parliaments. As has been well said, 'although there are many nations, there is only one civilisation'; and that 'one civilisation' can only survive and develop if both within each State, as well as between all States, the Rule of Law prevails.

HUGH H. L. BELLOT.

Art. 9.—THE FRIENDSHIP OF GREAT BRITAIN AND  
THE UNITED STATES.

THE War of American Independence inevitably left ill-feeling behind it. Nevertheless, it had barely closed when the natural good feeling and kinship of both sides found expression. David Hartley, one of the British Peace Commissioners, wrote in 1783: 'We may proceed to open an intercourse between our two countries, as nearly as possible, to the point of *as we were*.' He added: 'It may be that the Americans will never want an ally, but if they do, it is still in Great Britain.'

On the American side the olive branch was not held out quite so freely. Great Britain was a much more powerful State; the Peace of 1783 had left problems and claims behind it, and the Americans, quite intelligibly, remained a little suspicious of British designs. Yet John Adams, a very stern and active opponent of Great Britain during the war (and, indeed, afterwards), preferred the British to the French, as he found these in the last years of the Ancien Régime. 'What havoc,' he notes in his Diary, 'would these manners make in America! Our governors, our judges, our senators or representatives, or even our ministers, would be appointed by harlots for money.' He also quotes a remark about Frenchmen of his friend Jay, another of the American Revolutionary statesmen: 'He says they are not a moral people; they know not what it is; he don't like any Frenchmen.' John Adams came as the first American Minister to the Court of St James in 1785. King George III was much affected at their first meeting, 'and I confess I was not less so,' Adams notes in his Report. When he went to the House of Lords to see the trial of Warren Hastings he contrasted the gravity and dignity of the Peers, their intentness on the affairs of the nation, with the perfection of the French air, their external politeness and good breeding. The Frenchmen's superior polish, he seems to think, was in proportion to their inferior public spirit.

There was, as a matter of fact, not much opportunity for the natural friendliness of the British and Americans

to show itself or to be developed before 1814. The controversies about neutral trade and right of search leading to the War of 1812 greatly embittered the feelings of the two peoples. Even during the war, however, there occurred the famous reply of Captain Decatur, who captured a British frigate and entertained the officers, his prisoners. One of the officers suggested (as was quite true) that his ancestors were French. Decatur would have none of this. 'No, I beg pardon,' he replied, 'they were English.' They had been settled for two generations in America. Apparently this made them English.

The Treaty of Ghent, signed on Christmas Eve, 1814, ended the wars of the British and Americans. Mr. Hill, in his 'Leading American Treaties,' calls it 'the most popular agreement the United States has ever made.' From this time, at any rate until the 'forties, the diplomatic relations of Great Britain and the United States steadily improved.

The official representatives at London and Washington after the Peace of Ghent, Richard Rush and Charles Bagot, were popular men. They felt themselves at home in the country to which they were accredited. The American Minister Rush described his coming to England in 1817 in words of deep feeling :

'It is a remark of Humboldt, that no language can express the emotion that a European naturalist feels when he touches, for the first time, American land. May not the remark be reversed by saying, that no language can express the emotion which almost every American feels, when he first touches the shores of Europe. This feeling must have a special increase, if it be the case of a citizen of the United States going to England. Her fame is constantly before him; he hears of her statesmen, her orators, her scholars, her philosophers, her divines, her patriots. In the nursery he hears her ballads. Her language is his, with its whole intellectual riches, past and for ever newly flowing; a tie, to use Burke's figure, light as air and unseen, but stronger than links of iron. In spite of political differences, her glory allures him; in spite of hostile collision, he clings to her lineage.'

Rush, walking the quarter-deck with two British naval lieutenants, as the ship approached Portsmouth, had

'irrepressible feelings' when one of the lieutenants said: 'Think that we may be in the track of the Armada!' Sitting with his family in the George Inn at Portsmouth that evening, waiting for dinner, Rush heard bells ringing in the town. 'It passed in our thoughts that the same bells might have rung their hurras for the victories of Hawke and Nelson. "Perhaps," said one of the party, "for Sir Cloudesley Shovel's too."' It is not surprising that after coming to England in this frame of mind Rush found his association with Lord Castlereagh, Lord Liverpool, and the other British Cabinet Ministers—all of them charming gentlemen—very delightful. Charles Bagot, the British Minister at Washington, was a Tory aristocrat of the old school who must have found the American capital which was still half-built among the swamps of the Potomac, rather a rough place. Nevertheless he was able to spend his time both usefully and pleasantly. Neither Rush nor Bagot in any way sacrificed their countries' interests. Among other things their diplomacy resulted in the celebrated and long-lived Rush-Bagot Agreement for the restriction of armament on the Great Lakes.

It is a curious fact that while the Foreign Office and the State Department were becoming more and more conciliatory towards each other, the literary men were causing a good deal of bitterness. The responsibility for this lies with the British. Always great travellers, British subjects visited America continually from the close of the war of 1812-14. They observed, and noted their observations rather freely. Coming from a land of old, established culture, the visitors did not always make allowance for the inevitable crudity or rawness which they found here and there in the United States. They did not recognise the progress that was being made not merely in material things, but in the means of intellectual culture and social intercourse.

One of the best known of the British travellers was Captain Basil Hall, who visited North America in 1827 and 1828. Hall was an officer of the Royal Navy. The tradition of the service after the two recent wars was not very friendly to the United States. Nevertheless, his naval experiences in different parts of the world had made him change his views. 'My next anxiety,' he

writes, 'naturally was to persuade others that there were really no just grounds for the mutual hostility so manifestly existing between America and England.' He claims that 'there seldom was a traveller who visited a foreign land in a more kindly spirit.' His first impression fulfilled his expectation. After the long voyage by sailing ship, he wrote that a thousand years would not wipe out the memory of his first glorious breakfast in New York. The city greatly attracted him: 'There was so much about it that looked like England, that we half fancied ourselves back again; and yet there was quite enough to show in the next instant that it was a very different country. This indistinct, dreamy kind of feeling lasted for several days.' His American acquaintances were most kindly, and disposed to be friendly. Almost daily Hall was asked: 'What do you think of us upon the whole?' His American friends had always urged him to be frank. Accordingly, he says, he took them at their word, and never once qualified or disguised his sentiments, although these were not very flattering. He was pained to find that his remarks caused dissatisfaction, although he adds: 'I must do the Americans the justice to say that they invariably took my remarks in good part.' On the whole, Captain Hall was an appreciative traveller: he said many true and kind things about the places which he visited, such as West Point, Harvard, Philadelphia, Washington. But he mixed these with a good deal of criticism, advanced with a slight air of superiority. It has been recorded that his book 'exasperated the American public as had no earlier British work, and an astonishing chorus of rage went up from the press.'

The next writer who stirred up very unpleasant feeling in the United States was Mrs Frances Trollope, mother of the novelist, Anthony Trollope. She had emigrated to America and had set up a fancy-goods store in Cincinnati which failed. On returning to England she published 'Domestic Manners of the Americans,' in 1831. The book is not pleasant. Captain Hall had written like a gentleman, and had tried to be fair, although he had not been able to get rid of his attitude of 'Tory condescension,' as the Americans called it. Mrs Trollope, on the other hand, was in places simply

bitter. 'All animal wants,' she wrote, 'are supplied profusely at Cincinnati, and at a very easy rate; but alas! these go but a little way in the history of a day's enjoyment. The total and universal want of manners, both in males and females, is so remarkable, that I was constantly endeavouring to account for it.' In the only literary conversation which she heard in Cincinnati, a gentleman (according to her report) said to her: 'Shakespeare, madame, is obscene, and, thank God, we are sufficiently advanced to have found it out.' The conversation has all the appearance of having been 'written up'; it may be permitted to doubt whether the words, as reported, were really spoken. Mrs Trollope's book caused a furious uproar in America which is not yet forgotten. A good satire in the style of Pope was written called 'The Trollopiad':

'Ye wandering scribblers who infest the land,  
Spleen in your souls and papers in your hand;  
Whose hearts a "goodly matter" do indite,  
Who write to live—just heavens!—and live to write;  
Fools—vagrants—British scribblers, be my theme,  
Assist me, Trollope, in the worthy scheme.'

The writers who came after Mrs Trollope were much better. Harriet Martineau's 'Retrospect of Western Travel' was on the whole a just and sympathetic description written, as might be expected, with good taste. We find the sort of remark made by many Englishmen from Stratford Canning to the present day: 'In Philadelphia I had found perpetual difficulty in remembering that I was in a foreign country.' She liked the Southern gentry at Washington, but she could not refrain from trying to be clever at the expense of 'the odd mortals that wander in from the Western border.' Miss Martineau did not find any lack of culture. She writes of Washington society:

'Our pleasantest evenings were some spent in a society of the highest order. Ladies, literary, fashionable or domestic, would spend an hour with us on their way from a dinner or to a ball. Members of Congress would repose themselves by our fireside. Mr Clay, sitting upright on the sofa, with his snuff-box ever in his hand, would discourse for many an hour in his even, soft, deliberate tone, on any one of the great



subjects of American policy which we might happen to start, always amazing us with the moderation of estimate and speech which so impetuous a nature has been able to attain. Mr Webster, leaning back at his ease, telling stories, cracking jokes, shaking the sofa with burst after burst of laughter, or smoothly discoursing to the perfect felicity of the logical part of one's constitution, would illuminate an evening now and then. Mr Calhoun, the cast-iron man who looks as if he had never been born, and never could be extinguished, would come in sometimes to keep our understandings on a painful stretch for a short while, and leave us to take to pieces his close, rapid, theoretical, illustrated talk and see what we could make of it.'

The 'thirties and 'forties' were particularly rich in literary British travellers to America. As time went on they seemed to become more sympathetic. Captain Marryat visited the United States in 1837. He says in the introduction to his 'Diary in America': 'The Press was constantly pouring out works upon the new world so contradictory to each other, and pronounced so unjust by the Americans, that my curiosity was excited.' So he resolved to go himself. Once more the spontaneous and almost inevitable remark is made: 'On my first arrival I perceived little difference between the city of New York and one of our principal provincial towns; and, for its people, not half so much as between the people of Devonshire or Cornwall and those of Middlesex.' New York has certainly outgrown any provincialism; but its commanding metropolitan aspect strikes now equally strongly the chord of familiarity in every Englishman who knows London. After his journey was over Marryat came to the conclusion that British travellers and writers had been very unjust to America. They had not allowed for the fact that the American people, owing to the number of immigrants, was in a state of transition. They had 'searched with the curiosity of a woman, instead of examining and surveying with the eye of a philosopher.' The writers had also allowed themselves to be 'hoaxed.' If, wrote Marryat, the Americans 'have the slightest suspicion that a foreigner is about to write a book, nothing appears to give them so much pleasure as to try to mislead him.'

Charles Dickens was only thirty when he made his

first visit to the United States in 1842, but he was the most famous novelist in the English-speaking world. He had no lack of sympathy and imagination; and yet it cannot be said that his visit did much to cement the underlying friendship which exists, and existed then, between Great Britain and America. Yet he was in many respects an appreciative visitor. Boston, where he arrived, especially delighted him. He noted 'the attention, politeness and good humour' of the Customs officials, as contrasted with 'the servile rapacity of the French,' and the 'surly, boorish incivility' of the British officials. He delighted in the beautiful, white-painted houses of Boston, and in its 'intellectual refinement and superiority'; and he was glad to find not merely here, but everywhere he went in the United States, that his bedroom was 'spacious and airy.'

Clever, witty, and slightly absurd conversation was a form of writing that Dickens excelled in. This style, excellent for a novel, is not so suited for veracious travel sketches. This may explain why some of the conversations in 'American Notes' did not please the American public. He found the Americans—as every stranger finds them—to be polite. Yet he could not help making fun—just a little—of their conversation, not merely the conversations in the Hartford Lunatic Asylum (which he needlessly recorded in full) but conversations in railway trains:

'Everybody talks to you, or to anybody else who hits his fancy. If you are an Englishman, he expects that that railroad is pretty much like an English railroad. If you say "No," he says "Yes?"' (interrogatively) and asks in what respect they differ. You enumerate the heads of difference, one by one, and he says "Yes?"' (still interrogatively) to each. Then he guesses that you don't travel faster in England; and on your replying that you do, says "Yes?"' again (still interrogatively) and, it is quite evident, don't believe it. After a long pause he remarks, partly to you, and partly to the knob on the top of his stick, that, "Yankees are reckoned to be considerable of a go-ahead people too"; upon which *you* say "Yes," and then *he* says "Yes" again (affirmatively this time); and upon your looking out of window, tells you that behind that hill, and some three miles from the next station, there is a clever town in a smart

lo-ca-tion, where he expects you have con-cluded to stop. Your answer in the negative naturally leads to more questions in reference to your intended route (always pronounced rout); and wherever you are going, you invariably learn that you can't get there without immense difficulty and danger, and that all the great sights are somewhere else.'

Dickens had many fine and just things to say about New York and Washington; the last he calls the City of Magnificent Distances, or rather, Magnificent Intentions. But he introduces—and not merely once—the stale, ancient gibes about 'tobacco-tinctured saliva,' and how 'even steady old chewers of great experience are not always good marksmen.' The American scenes in 'Martin Chuzzlewit,' although not offensive, were written in the humorous, bantering spirit with which Dickens also wrote of English life, especially English low life. Nobody objected to it in England because it was done by an Englishman; but when it was done for America by a foreigner, the Americans were a little nettled.

This time was in fact the grandest period of American culture, a period in which the literary affinity of the British and American peoples could be clearly seen. Harriet Martineau met and formed a friendship with Emerson. Dickens, at Boston and New York, met Longfellow, Bancroft the historian, Dana the author of 'Two Years before the Mast,' Washington Irving, and William Cullen Bryant. The American writers were, indeed, much more open-hearted and generous towards England than at this time the English writers were towards them. Washington Irving was the writer who most vividly felt and described the essential friendship of the two peoples.

Irving paid a long visit to England in 1821. In the preface to 'Bracebridge Hall' he writes:

'England is as classic ground to an American, as Italy is to an Englishman. . . . It is difficult to describe the whimsical medley of ideas that throng upon his mind on landing among English scenes. He for the first time sees a world about which he has been reading and thinking in every stage of his existence. The recollected ideas of infancy, youth and manhood, of the nursery, the school and the study, come swarming at once upon him; and his attention is distracted between

great and little objects, each of which, perhaps, awakens an equally delightful train of remembrances. . . . How then did my heart warm when the towers of Westminster Abbey were pointed out to me, rising above the rich groves of St James's Park, with a thin blue haze above their grey pinnacles!

Then follow some more of these delightful reminiscences. Irving ends his preface by stating that he is no politician; as regards political views he contents himself, as in his religion, with the faith in which he was brought up—apparently one of kindness and kinship to England.

The charm of an English country house, its quiet, orderly routine, its air of cultured leisure, its wealth of objects of artistic or historical interest—the normal accumulations of a long past—its courteous and cheerful hospitality, vividly appealed to Washington Irving. The English country gentleman with his sense of honour and responsibility, of public service, profound 'without any of the degrading arts of popularity,' his good sense and good feeling, his time spent in sport, in study, or in 'friendly society collected within his own hospitable halls,' seems to have been Irving's ideal of the good life. Yet he yields to nobody in his American patriotism. In the middle of 'Bracebridge Hall' he interjects a story of New York, 'while it groaned under the tyranny of the English governor.' He denies that he views England with a partial eye; he alludes to his essay in the 'Sketch Book' on the literary feuds between England and America; and he points to the success of that brief paper to prove 'how much good feeling actually exists in each country towards the other, which only wants the slightest spark to kindle it into a genial flame. He appeals for a 'natural alliance of affection,' quoting from an article from the 'Quarterly Review':

'There is a sacred bond between us of blood and of language, which no circumstances can break. Our literature must be always theirs; and though their laws are no longer the same as ours, we have the same Bible, and we address our common father in the same prayer. Nations are too ready to admit that they have natural enemies; why should they be less willing to believe that they have natural friends?'

In 1833 Emerson visited England. His second visit was in 1847. He felt at home: 'England is a garden,'

he wrote. He acknowledges kinship in the widest sense: 'The American is only the continuation of the English genius into new conditions, more or less propitious.' The English-speaking race has a mixed pedigree on both sides of the Atlantic. 'Perhaps the ocean serves as a galvanic battery to distribute acids at one pole, and alkalies at the other. So England tends to accumulate her Liberals in America, and her Conservatives at London' ('English Traits').

Shortly after Emerson's second visit to England Nathaniel Hawthorne became American Consul at Liverpool (1853). He describes his office in words which now vividly recall the description given by Walter Hines Page of his Chancellery in Victoria Street:

'A narrow and ill-lighted staircase gave access to an equally narrow and ill-lighted passageway on the first floor, at the extremity of which, surmounting a door-frame, appeared an exceedingly stiff pictorial representation of the Goose and Gridiron, according to the English idea of those ever-to-be-honoured symbols. The staircase and passageway were often thronged, of a morning, with a set of beggarly and piratical-looking scoundrels (I do no wrong to our countrymen in styling them so, for not one in twenty was a genuine American), purporting to belong to our mercantile marine, and chiefly composed of Liverpool Black-ballers and the scum of every maritime nation on earth; such being the seamen by whose assistance we then disputed the navigation of the world with England.'

From this somewhat unpromising watch-tower Hawthorne surveyed English life and diversified his experience by journeys through the country. The result of his seven years' stay he recorded in a work which he significantly entitled 'Our Old Home.' Like every imaginative person he felt the charm of English life, although he continued to prefer American. He admired English villages, with their stone thresholds worn away by hobnailed footsteps of the cottagers' ancestors, 'shuffling over it from the reign of the first Plantagenet to that of Queen Victoria.' But—

'Better than this is the lot of our restless countrymen, whose modern instinct bids them tend always towards "fresh woods and pastures new." Rather than such monotony of sluggish ages, loitering on a village green, toiling in hereditary

fields, listening to the parson's drone lengthened through centuries in the grey Norman church, let us welcome whatever change may come—change of place, social customs, political institutions, modes of worship—trusting that, if all present things shall vanish, they will but make room for better systems, and for a higher type of man to clothe his life in them, and to fling them off in turn.'

It is clear that Hawthorne was a very discriminating friend. He had no desire to be English at all. He declares, however, that 'while an American willingly accepts growth and change as the law of his own national and private existence, he has a singular tenderness for the stone-encrusted institutions of the mother-country.'

In 1850 Motley, already famous as the author of the 'Dutch Republic,' came to England. One of the first people whom he met was Thackeray. If this English man of letters had once affected a sense of superiority, this had long ago been wiped away. Thackeray alluded to Holmes's 'Autocrat of the Breakfast Table,' then appearing serially in the 'Atlantic Monthly.' 'He next went on to observe,' writes Motley to Holmes, 'that no man in England could now write with that charming mixture of wit, pathos and imagination; that your papers were better by far than anything in their [the English] magazines.' Motley, like all his literary American colleagues, had no difficulty in adjusting himself to English society. He enjoyed everything, in a quiet way. He gave quite a good description of the Derby to his wife, and was amused by the fact that the favourite was 'Toxophilite,' which belonged to the Prime Minister, Lord Derby. He records: 'It is very generally believed that the Premier was much more anxious to win the "Derby," which Dizzy long ago termed "the blue riband of the turf," than to keep his post at the head of the Empire.' Country houses, society, the clubs, all appealed to Motley. He 'rather enjoyed' his own company when he dined at the Athenæum and found himself quite alone at his table; evidently, he had fallen easily into the British style. Milman, Macaulay, Thackeray, all the men of letters, were delightful to him. Macaulay's voice was beautiful in its intonations, 'although that is so



common a gift with Englishmen as to be almost a national characteristic.' Motley met all the statesmen too, Derby, Clarendon, Palmerston, Lord John Russell, and the rest. At a dinner at Lansdowne House he was amused (as he writes to his wife) by being taken for an Englishman. The lady whom he sat next remembered having met him casually at Lucerne, adding: "Why is it that we English, when we meet abroad, are so very friendly, and when we reappear in London, are so very hedgehoggy?" I told her that the reason why there was no hedgehogginess on this occasion was because I was not an Englishman. "From which of the sister islands, then?" she asked. "From none," I answered. "Then from one of the colonies?" "Yes," said I, "from Australia." Russell and Goderich laughed, and I left her to burst in ignorance.'

'I must say,' wrote Motley to Holmes, 'that I have, as I have always had, a warm affection for England and the English.' He returned to America in 1861, and used all his influence to maintain a favourable atmosphere between the two countries during the Civil War. He had remained in England just long enough to see the issuing of the 'United Netherlands,' which was published by John Murray in 1861. Before leaving England, Motley chronicled the return of the Prince of Wales from his tour in America, which had been a great success—'a magnificent demonstration.' Motley writes to his mother 'of the genuine and hearty good feeling that exists between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race.'

It was now the turn of an English man of letters to go and to record his impressions. So Anthony Trollope, whose mother's 'Domestic Manners' had created such a furore in the United States, went and wrote 'North America.' 'It has been the ambition of my literary life,' he states in the introduction, 'to write a book about the United States.' Trollope travelled in the Eastern States and went as far south as Washington. His book is, deliberately, not anecdotal. There is, naturally, much about the Civil War which was in progress. Trollope was in America meeting Union politicians, writers and members of the public, while the 'Trent Crisis' was exacerbating feelings between

Great Britain and America. He was, apparently, a little sympathetic towards the aims of the Southern States. But he admired the Northern soldiers, their self-denial, their patriotism. He admired the philosophical spirit in which politicians at Washington said: 'We are splitting into pieces and of course that is a gain to you. Take another cigar.' He came back to England with 'faith in the Northern army,' although he thought that the Gulf States would probably be able to maintain their secession. 'It is not better to rule in hell than to serve in heaven. . . . The hell to which I allude is the sad position of a low and debased nation. Such, I think, will be the fate of the Gulf States, if they succeed in obtaining secession.' His book was published in 1862.

Mr Freeman, one of the most widely read of historians, and a man who held very strong opinions, had written a 'History of Federal Government from the Foundation of the Achæan League to the Disruption of the United States.' The first volume, which traced Federal Government down to 145 B.C., appeared in 1863. No further volume was published. In 1882 he visited the United States, of which he was a great admirer. Fond of taking wide views of every subject with which he dealt, interested especially in tracing the continuity of historical forces, he stoutly maintained in his robust way that the Americans were merely Britons transplanted on the other side of the Atlantic. It was, in his view, owing to the fact that the British and Americans were really so similar, that the two nations were always comparing each other and finding differences.

'It is when things are very much alike that we most diligently mark the points in which they are not alike. Take, for instance, the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The main features in the constitution and customs of the two are so closely alike to one another, and so utterly unlike those of any other universities in the world, that there is a certain pleasure in tracing out the endless minute points in which they differ. So it is between England and America' ('Some Impressions of the United States').

Mr Freeman certainly appears to have felt himself at home in the United States. On landing at New York, his first impression was, 'How like England!' On re-

turning to Liverpool his first feeling was, 'How like America!' In the interval he had associated for months with people whom he found to be fundamentally English — 'more English, it may be, sometimes, than the kinsfolk whom they left behind in their older home.' Freeman's 'Impressions' were published in 1883.

Other British men of letters followed Freeman—Herbert Spencer, Matthew Arnold, and, in particular, James Bryce, at once the most sympathetic and the most discriminating of British observers. No praise is too high to be given to the author of the 'The American Commonwealth' as the interpreter of the United States to the British public, and even as, in a sense, the interpreter of the American public to itself. That great work of social and constitutional appreciation could only have been written by a man who was not, in essentials, a foreigner. A foreigner can write a profound philosophic description as Alexis de Tocqueville did of America, but he cannot write a flesh-and-blood description which the people described will recognise as true, balanced, fair, normal. This is what Bryce did. His book was first published in 1888. A masterly treatise from the American side is 'The Government of England,' by Mr Lowell, the President of Harvard, published in 1908.

The diplomatic relations of Great Britain and the United States prove how underlying community of sentiment and understanding can eliminate prejudice and solve serious disputes. Sir Charles Vaughan, Lord Lyons (in spite of the Civil War), Lord Pauncefoot, Lord Bryce, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, all had the happiest of personal relations in Washington. Their record of irritating and often profoundly serious disputes settled by negotiation bears witness to their diplomatic usefulness as well as to their social success. In Great Britain Charles Francis Adams, James Russell Lowell, John Hay, Whitelaw Reid, Walter Hines Page were able to establish social and diplomatic connexions which were of incalculable service to the cause of peace in both countries.

The position of Charles Francis Adams, Minister to the Court of St James during the Civil War, was the most difficult of all American diplomatists. He found

prejudice against him in London. He may also have brought some prejudice of his own with him. His son, in 'The Education of Henry Adams,' says :

'Thanks to certain family associations, Charles Francis Adams naturally looked on all British Ministers as enemies ; the only public occupation of all Adamses for a hundred and fifty years at least, in their brief intervals of quarrelling with State Street, had been to quarrel with Downing Street.

But the kind of reception given by British society to Minister Adams was quite different from that accorded to foreign diplomatists. He was treated by society as one of themselves, in opposition it is true, but still as, socially, a friend or almost a countryman, just as Liberal politicians were regarded by their Conservative opponents :

'Little by little, in private, society took the habit of accepting him, not so much as a diplomat, but rather as a member of opposition, or an eminent counsel retained for a foreign Government. He was to be received and considered ; to be cordially treated as, by birth and manners, one of themselves. This curiously English way of getting behind a stupidity gave the Minister every possible advantage over a European diplomat. Barriers of race, language, birth, habit, ceased to exist. Diplomacy held diplomats apart in order to save Governments, but Earl Russell could not hold Mr Adams apart. He was undistinguishable from a Londoner. In society few Londoners were so widely at home. None had such a double personality and corresponding double weight.'

Obviously, in London, Charles Francis Adams was among congenial people. And yet nobody could have fought harder for the rights of his country than he did.

Because he is moving in an atmosphere which is not merely congenial but also akin to his own, an American Ambassador in London often establishes delightful relations with the British Ministers. On this account they have sometimes been criticised in their own country as if they were sacrificing the influence of the United States. Henry Adams, in the description of his father's position quoted above, states that the unique social position of the American diplomatist was a distinct advantage to his country. John Hay at the end of the century

was also criticised for being 'pro-English,' whereas, he says—with a little humorous exaggeration—all that he had done was to wring concessions out of Great Britain and to give nothing in return. To-day the work of Walter Hines Page is exposed to similar criticism.

Page had received the same kind of upbringing as thousands of other cultivated Southerners. He had been at a classical university; he had taught; he had then taken up the career of a journalist. As editor of the 'Atlantic Monthly,' and afterwards of the 'World's Work,' he had done valuable literary work. He had a respect for English history, and English public men; but he came to his diplomatic post in London in 1913 with the prepossession that the Old World was past its best. The future lay with the American nation and he was tenacious of their rights.

From the moment that he came to London Page was attracted by British society, was at the same time aroused to keen criticism, and was also officially involved in a stubborn defence of his country's interests. His first ceremonial interview—in anticipation rather formidable—was with the King. It took place simply enough. Page for a few minutes afterwards conversed about the laborious and wearing office of President of the United States with Queen Mary. The Queen alluded to the position of King as an office. 'I am hoping that office will not kill the King,' she said. In Cabinet circles he recognised the type of public men which was his ideal for the United States: 'gently bred, high-minded, physically fit, intellectually cultivated, patriotic.' The rich families of Great Britain had habits which prevailed, although not nearly to the same extent, in America. 'When they make their money, they stop money-making and cultivate their own minds and their gardens and entertain their friends and do all the high arts of living—to perfection.' Page accepted the kinship of the British and American race simply as part of the nature of things—it was too obvious to be noticed. There was not merely kinship, there was fundamental goodwill. Leadership lay with the English-speaking people, but (in Page's view) it was passing to the American part of it. The vital question was, wrote Page to Wilson (Oct. 25, 1913): 'What are we going to do with the leadership of the

world presently when it clearly falls into our hands? And how can we use the English for the highest uses of democracy?’

This idea—that sooner or later the British and Americans would again be joined together, although, this time, with the Americans as the predominant partner—recurs persistently in Page’s correspondence. ‘The English and the whole English world are ours, if we have the courtesy to take them—fleet and trade and all; and we go on pretending we are afraid of “entangling alliances.” What about disentangling alliances?’ The language is exaggerated, as so often happens in familiar correspondence or conversation; but the idea is plain and convincing—that the English-speaking peoples have a common social and historical background, a spiritual solidarity, which transcends political divisions.

Page’s work in Britain during the War is now known to every one through the publication of his letters, surely some of the most moving correspondence that was ever penned. At the moment controversy centres in the United States over the question of the neutrality of his attitude, and adherence to Wilson’s views. Whatever be the verdict of historians on this point, on one other there is no doubt—that he felt the call of friendship between Great Britain and America in the strongest degree. The touching brief inscription on his memorial stone in Westminster Abbey truly testifies to this. Page’s sympathy, as Lord Grey points out in ‘Twenty-Five Years,’ was due to the fact that he saw the American ideals expressed in Great Britain’s attitude to the War.

It is often assumed that the friendship or feeling of kinship between Great Britain and the United States is a matter of importance chiefly to Great Britain. The opposite view is put forward strongly by Mr George Harvey, former American Ambassador to the Court of St James, in ‘The North American Review’ (December 1925):

‘No one country has ever had so huge a stake in another as the United States has to-day in Great Britain. It was a colossal undertaking on the part of England to pledge payment in gold of sums aggregating one-half of our great national debt. But appreciation of even that magnificent



commitment palls before the gratitude we should feel for her upholding the standard of integrity among nations, whose maintenance as an essential factor in the development of civilisation is now, at the beginning of our new career as the banker of the world, more vital to the continuing prosperity of our people than to that of any other.

'Our debt to England for proving the fidelity of our race, as distinguished thus far from others, to recognition of just obligations, is no more measurable in dollars than hers to us in honour.

'No doubt, as we are told persistently, it is our duty to help "the world"; but even obligations have degrees. Our first duty is to the one great country, that has established all Anglo-Saxons, our people no less than hers, as deservedly and unmistakably pre-eminent in financial integrity among the races of the earth.'

In the last three years the United States has experienced a time of unexampled prosperity. In the same period Great Britain has been passing through an economic depression which even if we search back to the post-Napoleonic war-period is without parallel. In such circumstances sympathy between friends naturally is more openly expressed. Sympathy may always exist, but bad times bring it to the surface. The 'New York Times,' commenting \* on Mr Baldwin's address to the Classical Association, had a leading article headed 'Ultimi Britanni.' The concluding paragraph is:

'A phrase of Homer or the end of a chorus of Euripides does pluck at the heart-strings, as the Premier says, but they give a glory that is beyond all other guerdon to the human spirit that grips, as these "Ultimi Britanni" are doing, with the "toils of destiny itself." There is nothing more deserving of our admiration in the world around than their heroic, quiet struggle, led by a straight, truthful statesman who declines to take himself tragically and who is "steeped to the lips" in historical sense.'

Thus the great organ of moderate opinion in America stretches hands across the sea.

R. B. MOWAT.

---

\* Jan. 10, 1926.

# Art. 10.—THE PASSING OF THE LIBERAL PARTY.

THE recent secession of Sir Alfred Mond, coupled with other sinister movements, marks an important stage in the disintegration of the once great Liberal Party. That a party which for nearly fifty years in the 19th century was predominant in the State and, after its decline set in in 1885, remained until the Great War undoubtedly the second party; which in fact secured for itself the greatest of its election triumphs as recently as 1906, should be hastening to utter annihilation is the strangest phenomenon in contemporary politics. Strange, too, it may seem that the defection of Sir Alfred Mond should have shaken the Liberal Party to its foundations. He is just the sort of man who, in the palmy days of Liberalism, one would have expected to find a prominent member of that party. A wealthy man but not of British descent, he would hardly have had, in years gone by, much chance of distinction among the Conservatives. His ability and wealth made him an ornament to Liberalism. But with ability and wealth he also possesses political courage and honesty, and his defection proves conclusively that a particularly capable and clear-sighted politician can see no hope either for the country or for his own future in modern Liberalism.

The position of the Liberal Party is indeed tragic. Reduced to a rump of about forty members in the House of Commons, they are hopelessly divided among themselves. Their nominal leader is Lord Oxford and Asquith, whose defects in leadership have contributed largely to their ruin; their nominal Chairman in the House of Commons is Mr Lloyd George, whose clever but disruptive personality has, more than anything else, blown them to atoms. Notwithstanding his services in the War, indeed largely because of them, more than half his nominal followers hate and distrust Mr Lloyd George, while nearly all those Liberals who in the past attached themselves to him are visibly anxious to find some pretext for following the lead of Sir Alfred Mond. The Liberal Party could boast of about three million electors in the country at the last general election: how many of these are prepared to support it now? Many un-

doubtedly will join the Conservative Party, others will go to Labour. New recruits cannot be looked for. No young man with political ambition can be expected to join a moribund party.

The real explanation of this extraordinary political eclipse is to be found, not so much in the incompetent leadership of Lord Oxford and his friends or in the disruptive tactics of Mr Lloyd George, however much they may have contributed to it, but in the simple fact that the day of Liberalism is over, that the party has no longer any 'raison d'être.' The conditions under which it arose and flourished have entirely disappeared. The Liberal Party was a temporary product of the 19th century. It was formed out of two distinct and separate bodies. The older of these were the Whigs, the lineal descendants of the Roundheads of Charles the First's day, who, later on, had brought about the Hanoverian succession. Against them were arrayed the old Tories, lineal descendants of the Cavaliers, who for the most part had been Jacobites until the accession of George III. The Whigs had carried the great Reform Act of 1832, and had thereby won a signal though belated triumph over the Tories. This party, with its Puritan traditions, naturally attracted to itself the Nonconformist elements in the country, and later on the 'political dissenter' became a power in the land on the Liberal side. The other and newer body were the Radicals, who aimed at far more drastic political change than had been achieved by the Whigs in 1832, their left wing being the supporters of the great Charter of 1848. This party adopted the commercial policy of free imports, their real leaders being Cobden and Bright, and the 'Manchester School' of politicians, and their philosopher and high priest John Stuart Mill. Confronted with the Conservative Party, formed by Sir Robert Peel out of the old Tories, they were further reinforced by the accession of the Peelites, who left the Conservatives on the Free Trade question. With them came Gladstone, the fine flower of Liberalism, under whom the party reached its zenith. In this new party the Radicals, who had a clearly defined policy, made the pace, the Whigs lumbering slowly behind them, but always controlling the party organisation and the party purse.

So far as Home affairs were concerned, the Liberal policy as expounded by the Radicals was one of complete freedom from political restraint and of 'laissez-faire' in trade, commerce, and social relationships. 'Free the people from all political handicaps and restraints,' they said, 'free trade from all shackles and impediments, and all will be for the best in the best of all possible worlds.' The circumstances of the middle of the 19th century were entirely favourable to their views. Political reform had been delayed too long in this country, and a great democratic wave appeared to be spreading over the Continent of Europe. Moreover, the industrial system had just been established here; there was a great expansion of trade and manufacture, and an immense increase of population. Free imports meant cheaper food for the people, and cheaper raw material for our factories, and the doctrines of Mill and Cobden appeared to be eminently suited to the condition of England at the time. The idea that the people should be free to govern themselves, that trade should be freed from all restrictions, that Government interference in commerce and in all the social relations of life should be reduced to a minimum, appealed to the majority at that time, who were told by the Liberal leaders that somehow or other the greatest happiness of the greatest number would ensue. They did not worry themselves about the smaller number, whose lot apparently might be one of utter wretchedness. Has not Mr Birrell, a true Liberal, told us in recent years that minorities must suffer? In the 'sixties and 'seventies they nearly reached Herbert Spencer's ideal of government, which has been described as 'Anarchy plus the Policeman.' If everybody, peer and peasant, employer and employee, landlord and tenant, were allowed to pursue a policy of enlightened self-interest, free from all government interference and control, all, they believed, would be well. Wealth they thought was the only road to happiness, man being exclusively a money-making machine.

With regard to foreign and colonial affairs, their policy was not so simple, since in these departments of Government the Whigs did not allow the Radical Free Traders to have it all their own way. The policy of the latter indeed was simplicity itself. It may be summed

up in the one word—non-intervention. Cobden and his friends wished to keep England entirely free from all foreign complications and alliances, being convinced that free trade would by itself produce good will among nations, and that its advantages were so patent that every foreign nation would adopt it in a few years' time. They made no allowance for the entirely different conditions existing on the Continent. They had a grand conceit of the immense superiority of Englishmen over all foreigners, whom they regarded chiefly as customers for our manufactures, and to whom they wished such a measure of prosperity as would enable them to purchase from us on a satisfactory scale. Their policy was at least simple and straightforward, and it enabled them to be consistent opponents of war and armaments, and advocates of rigid economy in the great spending departments. 'Peace at any Price' was their motto, or at least the motto of most of them, and they rallied round their banner all the fanatics and 'Little Englanders' in the country. For the British Colonies they had little use; they regarded them merely as customers on a small scale, who would inevitably remain customers even if they ceased to belong to the Empire. For the rest they thought them a nuisance entailing serious naval and military responsibilities, and they longed for the day when they would, as the phrase went, 'cut the painter.' This policy of non-intervention, had it been consistently carried out, would probably have landed the country in grave disaster later on, since the position of England and her security have always depended on preventing any one power becoming predominant in Europe. For this reason we had fought Spain and France in the past, and were compelled to fight Germany in 1914. It was combined, however, with another policy, which was the special policy of the Whigs, and the alternations between the two made 'Liberal' foreign policy almost a byword of ineptitude and inefficiency all over the world.

The Whig foreign policy consisted in the idea of supporting what they regarded as 'Liberalism' all over Europe, and anywhere else in the world. Now, European 'Liberalism' was a striving after nationalism and unity on national lines, which the Whigs fondly believed would result in the setting up of a number of States with

Liberal constitutions modelled on the British constitution, which would immediately adopt the sacred principles of Free Trade, and remain for ever the placid customers of wealthy manufacturing Britain. In order to secure this result the Whig statesmen of the Palmerston and John Russell type thought it their duty to intervene in every dispute between a governing power and their revolted or down-trodden subjects especially if they were of a different race, and they spent their time in lecturing and hectoring Russia, Turkey, Austria, and the small Italian Governments, urging them to make concessions to 'Liberalism.' They were unable, as a rule, however, to go beyond the stage of hectoring, since, as they consistently starved our armaments, we were never ready to fight, in addition to which the Radical wing of the party objected to all war on principle. The result was that we were frequently made to look ridiculous on the Continent, nobody taking our blustering and threats seriously. Thus, in 1863, Lord John Russell presented an ultimatum to the Russian Government, which was engaged in the familiar process of putting down its Polish subjects who had risen in revolt. His action caused immense enthusiasm in Poland, and encouraged the Poles to resist to the uttermost. He had secured the support of France, always the friend of Poland, and Napoleon III began to make preparations for war. When, however, Prince Gortschakov curtly refused Russell's demands, the latter beat a hasty retreat, leaving France in the lurch and the Poles to their fate. The French Emperor never forgave England the treatment he had then received. In the following year, when Denmark was threatened by Prussia and Austria over the Schleswig-Holstein question, Palmerston used language which certainly led the Danes to expect that we should intervene on their behalf. When, however, she was attacked by these two Powers we, of course, did nothing, thereby making ourselves look ridiculous in Europe for the second time in two years, and earning the contempt of foreign nations.

Under Gladstone, however, who appears to have combined in his complex personality all the contradictory strains which made up 'Liberalism,' British foreign policy went from bad to worse, so much so that even



Russell complains in his Memoirs that he had practically effaced our influence in Europe. He was animated by a deep distrust and hatred of France, and rejoiced in her defeat in the Franco-Prussian war, holding that the unification of Germany under Prussia would be an advantage to this country. At the same time, his moral consciousness revolted against the idea of the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine. Having pursued a policy of what Disraeli used to call 'masterly inactivity' till it was too late, he at last made an attempt at mediation, to find his proposals rudely turned down by Bismarck. At the same time, Russia quietly denounced the Black Sea clauses of the Treaty of Paris. Lord Granville, Gladstone's Foreign Minister, wrote a strong dispatch of protest; war with Russia was loudly discussed; but, of course, nothing happened, except that a European Conference was assembled which confirmed Russia's action!

Gladstone's subsequent record in foreign and colonial affairs is one long catalogue of humiliation for this country. He violently opposed and seriously embarrassed Disraeli's Eastern policy, making tremendous political capital out of the 'Bulgarian atrocities,' and holding up Russia, 'Holy Russia' as he called her, notwithstanding her treatment of the Poles and other subject races, as the champion of the liberation of Eastern Christendom. On returning to office in 1880, he reversed the policy of the Berlin Treaty whereby England would have supervised Turkish reforms in her Christian provinces, and adopted a policy of complete hostility to the Turks. The effect of this was to drive the Porte into the hands of the Germans, with the result in the recent war which we know. In Egypt he got involved in a serious war, and subsequently, when the Soudan revolted, took no steps to quell the revolt beyond sending General Gordon to Khartoum, where he abandoned him until it was too late to rescue him. Even when we were fighting the Soudanese, he described them as 'rightly struggling to be free.' Lastly, he went to war with the Boers in South Africa, who had taken advantage of the well-known Liberal weakness to rise against our rule, and after the one defeat at Majuba Hill concluded an ignominious peace. Never had England's prestige sunk so low as when the Liberal Government was turned out of

office in 1885. Liberal foreign policy was clearly played out. It had completely failed in both its objects. It had failed to keep the country out of war. It is a curious fact that three out of the four serious wars in which this country has been engaged in the last hundred years, the Crimean, the Egyptian, and the recent Great War, were entered into by Liberal Governments. The fourth, the South African war, was the direct consequence of the Liberal policy after Majuba Hill. Similarly, it had failed completely in its object of creating a number of new nationalities with Liberal institutions on the Continent. It is true that both Germany and Italy had become united kingdoms, but this had been effected in Germany not by Liberalism, but by 'blood and iron,' and the result was a highly centralised and autocratic military monarchy which became the bully of Europe and the dangerous rival of the British Empire. Even if Italy enjoyed a more or less liberal constitution, she had entered into a military treaty with Germany. For the rest, Hungary remained part of the Austrian Dominion, Poland was still divided and oppressed, and whatever movements in the direction of freedom had been accomplished in the Balkans had taken place in spite of 'Holy Russia,' not as the result of her action. Finally, none of the new states had adopted Free Trade. On the contrary, they had proceeded to build up tariff walls, higher and higher, in order to protect their industries from our exports. So successful were their efforts that some of them actually began to manufacture on a very large scale, and to dump their surplus goods here! However, Liberal ingenuity was equal to this. They explained that dumping was good for the country in which it took place!

If, therefore, the foreign policy of the Liberal party had completely failed and is to-day in no way applicable to conditions in Europe or in the world generally, a similar fate befell their Colonial and Home policy. As to the Colonies, they showed no inclination whatever to act on the Radical hints that they had better quietly separate from the Empire and fend for themselves. On the contrary, they grew up, much to the astonishment and embarrassment of the Liberals, into great self-governing Dominions, proud to belong to the Empire

and intensely loyal to the Crown. Liberal politicians had to adjust themselves to this new condition of affairs, and there grew up in the party a school of so-called 'Liberal Imperialists,' who talked very big about the Empire when in Opposition, but as a rule did very little for it when in Office. As to Home affairs, events took a very different course from that which had been anticipated. It is true that under the régime of 'laissez-faire' the country grew richer in bulk and the population increased enormously, but in the fierce unregulated competition which ensued the rich grew richer and the poor poorer. Immense new fortunes were made, but the condition of the workers grew steadily worse. The housing of the immense new industrial population became a scandal to the world. The absence of proper regulation of factories and workshops entailed an enormous amount of unnecessary suffering. Wages were low, profits were high. We were arriving at the greatest happiness not of the greatest, but of the smallest, number. As regards trade, after a period of unexampled prosperity, during which we practically became the workshop of the world, the appearance of foreign rivals, as already mentioned, began seriously to interfere with our industry. We found it increasingly difficult to export our products, and as we had abandoned all import duties, except such as were required for revenue purposes, we had no weapons with which to fight hostile tariffs. The Colonies, meanwhile, were anxious to come to our aid, and were offering Imperial Preference. Liberalism remained, however, blind to these facts, and, while the demand for social reform at home and Imperial developments overseas became more and more insistent, the Liberals pursued their political path, passing Ballot Acts, lowering and rigging the franchise, toying with Irish Nationalism, and the like. It is a fact that through all the years during which the Liberals were in power between 1846 and Mr Gladstone's death in 1898, scarcely a single measure of social reform was placed on the Statute Book. The early efforts of Conservative social reformers, such as Disraeli and Lord Shaftesbury, were greeted either with derision or with blank opposition. Cobden himself had an intense hatred of trades unions, which were first legalised by a Conservative Government. He

would sooner live under the Dey of Algiers, he said, than under a trades council. All social reform was of course an interference with 'laissez-faire' and inconsistent with the basic principle of Liberalism. Prof. Bonamy Price, an economist whose views were favoured by Gladstone, said that limitation of hours of labour was an infringement of Free Trade. It 'taxed the community with dearer goods in order to confer special advantages on the working-man.'

Meanwhile, the Conservative Party, led by Disraeli, in their short intervals of office were endeavouring to ameliorate the condition of the people by tentative measures of social reform. Housing and Building Acts rendered the creation of new slums and rookeries impossible and did something to remove the existing slums. The most important question of sanitation was dealt with by the great Public Health Act of 1875. A series of coal-mines and factory regulation Acts removed the greatest evils from which the workers suffered. Many Liberals were compelled to admit the failure of their policy and became themselves social reformers; but it was not until Mr Lloyd George introduced his Old Age Pensions measure, the idea of which he had borrowed from Mr Chamberlain, who had long before deserted official Liberalism and allied himself with the Conservatives, that a Liberal Government ever introduced a first-rate measure of social reform. By so doing, they confessed to the bankruptcy of the old Liberal policy. 'Laissez-faire' was clearly no longer possible. The 'masses,' who had been claimed by Gladstone as being the special care of the Liberal Party and had now been enfranchised by the Conservative Reform Act of 1867, demanded something more satisfying than further political change. They were not particularly attracted either by Home Rule for Ireland or Disestablishment of the Church in Wales. To a starving man living in a horrible and overcrowded slum the offer of a vote was a mockery, even if some of the 'classes,' for whom alone according to Gladstone the Conservatives cared, were deprived of some of their votes. Liberalism had to adopt social reform or perish, as the younger school of Liberals clearly saw. The difficulties in the way were great, however, since the Liberal Party fund always

depended on the long purses of rich industrial magnates who had built up colossal fortunes out of free imports and freedom from control, and to whom any sort of Government interference was anathema. The only way by which they could be reconciled to it was a copious distribution of honours; but the recipients, when they arrived in the House of Lords, generally turned Conservative, and further supplies were not forthcoming. The commercial gentleman of Liberal principles who had secured a Peerage by a large contribution to the party fund was often a terrible snob, and it was far more *chic* to be a Conservative than a Liberal peer. The old Whig element of the party, moreover, was intensely conservative in the narrow sense of the term, and did not wish to deviate a hair's breadth from the old Liberal principles. The eternal principles of Free Trade, so-called, had become a fetish more sacred than the Ten Commandments. This was the position down to 1906. The writer of this article has a vivid recollection of the violent opposition of Radical employers in the House of Commons to Mr Chamberlain's first Compensation for Accidents Bill, introduced while Lord Salisbury was Prime Minister.

Meanwhile, an event had occurred which was destined in a few years to destroy Liberalism. This was the formation of the Labour Party. Organised Labour, i.e. the trades unions, which had for many years been growing in strength, had so far consistently supported the Liberal Party. A very large proportion of the working classes, at many elections the majority, had voted Conservative ever since 1874, especially since the tergiversation of Gladstone and the official Liberal Party on the Home Rule question in 1886. But organised Labour remained consistently Liberal and constituted the rank and file of Liberalism, just as Nonconformity supplied the local leaders in most constituencies. The reason for this is not altogether clear, but probably the cheap food cry, coupled with Gladstone's pretence that Liberalism was the party of the 'People' (with a very big 'P'), and that he stood for the masses as opposed to the classes, had a great deal to do with it. The leaders of organised Labour gradually became painfully aware of the humbug of these Liberal professions, and began to realise

that they were mere hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Liberal Caucus. They supplied three-quarters of the votes at elections, and when the Liberals got into office they were treated as dirt. When they demanded social reform, they were usually fobbed off with some new political reform coupled with the specious pretence that the Liberals were their real friends. Consequently, they decided to have their own party, which was really to look after the interests of Labour. This new party was a very small thing to start with. A few more or less tame Labour members were returned at most general elections between 1886 and 1906, but were almost indistinguishable from the Radical wing of the Liberal Party. They were flattered and cajoled by the astute heads of Liberalism, and occasionally were given minor offices in the Government, but nothing serious was attempted to further their views. Some of them, however, notably the late Mr Keir Hardie, realised the absurdity of their position, and, reinforced by a band of intellectual Socialists, whose economic views had been borrowed from the Continent, chiefly from the teaching of Karl Marx, formed the Independent Labour Party. Then, in 1906, Liberalism played into their hands. Desperately anxious to get back into office, and to defeat the Conservatives who had been in power for twenty years (with one short interval from 1892 to 1895), they entered into a political pact with the Independent Labour Party, allowing them to secure some forty seats, in many cases without Liberal opposition. This action, much more than Mr Asquith's error in putting the Socialists into power in 1924, sealed the fate of Liberalism. Their greatest triumph in 1906 (the greatest electoral victory won by any party since the election of the Reform Parliament in 1832) was also their undoing. The Labour Party rapidly became the real opposition to Conservatism, and the once great Liberal Party sank into the background. At every general election after 1906 Labour grew and Liberalism diminished until, in 1918, Labour became the official Opposition. The Liberal Government of 1906, by their folly, assisted the growth of Labour. By the Trades Disputes Act, the trades unions were placed above the law and could employ their funds with immunity for almost any purpose, legal



or illegal. The very unfair political levy was permitted. The Labour Party never showed the slightest gratitude to the Liberals for these concessions, but merely employed them to destroy Liberalism.

Then, in 1914, came the Great War, into which the Liberals drifted without any adequate preparation. The old tradition of distrust of France and approval of United Germany blinded them to the fact that we had nothing to fear from France nowadays, whereas modern Germany, having secured her position as the greatest power on the Continent, wished to become the greatest power in the world, and nothing but the British Empire stood in its way. Yet at times they were alarmed by the German menace and the creation of the German Navy, and they entered into certain military and naval arrangements with France, without, however, committing themselves to go to war on the French side if the Germans attacked. No doubt up to the very last moment the Germans never believed that the Liberal Government were in earnest, thinking that they would be frightened off, as Lord John Russell and Mr Gladstone had been frightened off in past years, and it is almost certain that the Liberal Government would never have declared war but for the colossal blunder of the Germans in attacking Belgium. Here was a case of a great bullying power invading a small nation in the integrity of which England had always been interested, and to which she was pledged, that gave the Liberals the necessary excuse for action. Even so, it required the patriotic assurance of support by the Conservative Leaders to bring them to a decision. The events of the War, however, quickly disintegrated the Liberal Party. Like the ramshackle Austrian Empire, it could not stand the shock of war. Its early policies having failed, it had become a mere congeries of conflicting sects—Old Whigs, Free Trade Radicals, Irish Home Rulers, Welsh Dis-establishers, Peace-at-any-Price faddists, teetotal fanatics, and Liberal-Socialists, whose views were indistinguishable from those of the Labour Party; a really ramshackle party indeed. The one object of its existence, the one thing which preserved any semblance of unity, was the desire to remain in office and to keep the Tories out. With this object in view they had invented the

infamous Chinese Slavery cry at the general election of 1906; with the same object, when their popularity began to wane, they introduced and carried the 'People's Budget,' one of the greatest political frauds ever perpetrated, since the cost of collecting the wonderful new land taxes greatly exceeded the money collected, and the Act was quietly repealed a few years later, Mr Lloyd George himself assenting to the repeal. The only permanent result of the 'People's Budget' was that by frightening the building trade it created the housing difficulty, from which the people have suffered ever since. With the same object in view, the cumbrous and ill-thought-out Health Insurance Act was passed, with its 'rare and refreshing fruit' and '9d. for 4d.' Then, in order to placate the Irish Nationalists and the Welsh Radicals, who, after the general elections of 1910, held the Government in the hollow of their hands, the Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment Bills were introduced. Ireland had enjoyed an extraordinary measure of peace and prosperity for some years, and seemed to be entering into a happier state of existence, when the whole question of Irish government was, for party purposes, thrown again into the melting-pot. In order to carry these measures, the veto of the Lords was destroyed by the Parliament Act without any attempt being made to reform the constitution of the Upper House, though this was solemnly promised, so that we have had ever since in effect single chamber government, unlike any other democratic country in the civilised world. On the very eve of the War, the country found itself on the verge of civil war, thanks entirely to the folly of the Government's Irish policy. What greater condemnation could there be of the Liberal Party?

Such a party was naturally incapable of carrying on a great world war. Within nine months of the commencement of hostilities, Mr Asquith's Government had come hopelessly to grief and the first Coalition had to be formed. The new Government, however, though a few Conservatives had been admitted to office, was no great improvement on its predecessor, since there was far too great a preponderance of official Liberals in its ranks, most of whom never believed in ultimate victory and would undoubtedly have concluded an ignominious

peace. The formation of the Lloyd George Coalition, which saved the country, shivered the party to atoms, and no amount of medicine or surgery has ever been able to reunite its shattered limbs. The Medicine-Man-in-chief, Sir Alfred Mond, who laboured more than any one else to heal the sore, and who, on the morrow of the fall of the Lloyd George Coalition in 1922, talked glibly about being a Liberal 'without prefix or suffix,' has given up the case as hopeless and has joined the Conservatives. Meanwhile, Lord Oxford and Asquith waits and sees (or rather waits and does not see, for what is there he could see?), while Mr Lloyd George searches hopelessly for a policy to attract or delude voters. Now and again he thinks he has found one, but it is promptly rejected by half of the exiguous remains of the Liberal Party.

There is in fact no policy open to the Liberal Party. Their day is gone. The Great War showed conclusively that their foreign policy had been a complete failure. The old plan of unregulated individualism in social relations, of unrestricted free imports in trade and of studied contempt of our Colonies and Dominions, has hopelessly broken down. It may have appealed to many people, even to some great and wise ones, in the last half of the 19th century, but it has no application now. In the political slang of the day, it is 'off the map.' Liberalism now vainly attempts to steer a middle course, at one moment proclaiming its devotion to Imperialism and its horror of Socialism, at another aping the Socialism of the Labour Party and professing sympathy with international movements, the real object of which is to overthrow what is called 'capitalism' all over the world. Traditions linger long in this country, and it may be some years before Liberalism finally disappears, and, indeed, its disappearance is from one point of view not to be desired. A middle party holding the balance between the Conservatives and Socialist-Labour may delay for some time the triumph of the latter. The question is whether Liberalism is strong enough now to hold the balance between any parties. Recent bye-elections seem to show that its continued existence is likely to do immense harm, since it withdraws a certain number of votes from the Conservatives with-

out having the slightest chance of returning its own candidates.

Not only has its policy vanished, but its constituent elements have also largely disappeared. In Gladstone's day, Liberalism relied chiefly upon two things—first the Labour vote, and secondly Nonconformity, which was political and aggressive. Labour supplied the rank and file which has now left Liberalism and votes Socialist. The writer used to be well acquainted with a certain industrial constituency, four-fifths of the voters of which belonged to the working class. The parties there were very evenly divided, Conservative and Liberal getting in almost alternately by small majorities. No Liberal candidate ever puts up there now; he would not have a ghost of a chance if he did. The Liberal rank and file has almost all gone over to the Socialists and a straight and close fight takes place at every election between a Conservative and a Labour candidate. This is typical of what has occurred in most industrial constituencies, where the Liberal Party may be compared with the Peruvian army, which is said to have contained nobody beneath the rank of corporal. As to Nonconformity, it has ceased to be the tremendous political force it was. This is partly due to the present unfortunate indifference to religion manifested by all classes, which has tended to bring the leaders of Nonconformity into closer union with the leaders of the Church, thus eradicating the old political sting. It is still more due to the fact that the Labour Party as such is essentially non-religious. We do not say irreligious, since it contains among its leaders many truly religious men, but as a party it has no concern whatever with religious ideals. Like Gallio, it cares for none of these things. It is interested in wages, hours of labour, nationalisation of trade and abolition of 'capitalism,' the success or failure of Moscow, and a hundred other things, and in no way in religion. A remarkable instance of this is to be found in Wales. The Liberal Party, which was essentially a chapel party, was for many years the strongest party in the Principality, in fact, at one time it enjoyed a practical monopoly of Welsh representation in Parliament: now it is the weakest party in Wales. Conservatism has made strides in the North and in Central Wales; while

the South Wales coalfield, where half the population resides, votes solidly for Labour. The great days of Welsh Liberalism have gone beyond recall.

The political fight of the future lies between Conservatism and Socialist Labour. The former party confronted with Socialism proceeds by the method of regulating industrial conditions, while leaving industry in private hands; the latter aims at nationalising industry, and, by abolishing private profit, would destroy all incentive to enterprise. The Labour-Socialists care little for foreign politics, except in so far as they can be made to serve the interests of a sort of international proletariat; and though the more sensible of their leaders are aware of the complete failure of Soviet rule in Russia, Moscow exercises a fatal fascination over them. To the majority of them—though not to certain of their leaders, such as Mr MacDonald and Mr Thomas—the existence of the British Empire is an evil as interfering with internationalism; while their one idea of improving trade at home is to raise wages and shorten hours, putting on the dole those who cannot find work at such rates that many of them will never want to work again. Beyond all things their sovereign remedy for every ill is to ‘abolish capitalism’ by nationalising industry. In this policy some go further than others; there are endless shades of opinion in the ranks of the Labour Party, but to ‘abolish capitalism’ is generally the supreme end.

As between these two conflicting views of government there is no middle course, no room for the Liberal Party. Mr Lloyd George’s policies are really milk-and-water nationalisation. Those people who favour nationalisation will naturally look for the real thing in the policy of the Labour Party, those who object to nationalisation will look to the Conservative Party to resist it. The Liberal Party in its present organisation and existence is a pretence and a sham. Like all shams it must perish.

A PRIVY COUNCILLOR.

## Art. 11.—THE REGISTER OF ARCHBISHOP PARKER.

1. *Registrum Matthæi Parker, partes I-VI.* Canterbury and York Society. London: various dates. And in manuscript at Lambeth Palace.
  2. *A History of the Church of England from 1558 to 1624.* By W. H. Frere. Macmillan, 1904.
  3. *Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders.* By Arthur Stapylton Barnes. Longmans, 1922.
  4. *Bishop Barlow's Consecration and Archbishop Parker's Register, with some new Documents.* By Claude Jenkins. Journal of Theological Studies, October 1922. Milford.
  5. *Archbishop Parker.* By W. M. Kennedy. Pitman, 1908.
  6. *Visitation Articles of the Period of the Reformation.* Vols. 1 and 3. Edited by Walter Howard Frere. Longmans, 1910.
- And other works.

AMONG the materials which exist in manuscript and have not yet been fully utilised by students of English history few, if any, are more valuable than the episcopal registers. And gradually these are being explored and edited. While scholars who combine a knowledge of jurisprudence with that of economics, such as the late Sir Paul Vinogradoff, Prof. Stenton, and Sir William Ashley—not to mention the *clarum nomen* of F. W. Maitland, who was in some directions of these subjects a pioneer—have brought us face to face with forgotten facts in law and social conditions upon which alone new and sound conclusions can be based, scholars have been writing with assiduity in a less known field. In the neglected by-paths of our Ecclesiastical History a Society which is even now not nearly so well known as it deserves to be has been working with patience and success. It is now more than twenty-one years since the Canterbury and York Society was founded for the purpose of printing Bishops' registers and other ecclesiastical records. Its Presidents are the two Primates, and of its founders not a few scholars still survive. Its members include many who do not belong to the Church of England; Cardinal Gasquet, for example, who was one of its original sup-



porters, is a Vice-President. Beside him are several judges and bishops. Its treasurer is the Bursar of Winchester College, and its general editor that energetic and capable historian, Miss Rose Graham. The work that it has done in the last few years, with too little public recognition, is really remarkable. The episcopal registers of the See of Hereford from 1275 to 1539, most ably edited, have been published, with the exception, it appears, of the later years of Bishop John Gilbert, i.e. from 1379 to 1389, and those of Bishops Edmund Hardley and Hadrian de Castello, 1492 to 1504. Of the Lincoln registers, those of Hugh de Wells, Robert Grosseteste, and Richard Gravesend; of Winchester, those of John of Pontoise, and John White; of Carlisle, those of John Halton; and of London, those of Baldock, Segrave, Newport, and Gravesend (1304-1338), have been some time in print; while work of extreme value has been done by Prof. Hamilton Thompson on the Visitations of Religious Houses 1420-1449, the Lincoln Episcopal Records 1571-85 by Canon Wilmer Foster, and on the chapters of the Augustinian Canons by the Rev. H. E. Salter. Among material which is announced to be in preparation but is not mentioned in the 1925 list of the Society's publications as ready, will be found the most important registers of Peckham and Winchelsey, of Wolsey and Gardiner. But in some ways most important of all is the Register of Archbishop Parker, of which (though strangely this does not appear in the list dated 1925) six parts are already in the hands of the public. Further publication is, alas, suspended for lack of funds. The name of the editor is not given on the cover of these issues; but the list already referred to shows, in a note of what is 'in preparation,' that they are the work of the present Bishop of Truro. Dr Frere's history of the English Church in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I proves that he possesses the highest gifts of a historian, a sound judgment and a candid mind; but in addition to that work there are his less known but at least equally valuable labours on the Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the period of the Reformation. One may be quite sure that any historical work produced by Dr Frere will be an important contribution to sound learning.

Matthew Parker, the wise choice of Elizabeth's ministers, and perhaps of the Queen herself, is well worth minute study. Retiring though he was, and modest in character, he was an outstanding personage in a time most critical in English history. His register might well be presumed to illustrate his personal character, as the Bishop of Worcester has recently most admirably shown can be done in the case of one of his own predecessors. Parker's character has already been sketched by Dr Frere in his history, by Prof. W. M. Kennedy in an excellent biography, and, more recently, by Dr Pearce, Master of the Archbishop's old College, in a delightful commemorative lecture delivered last year at the celebration of his memory at Cambridge. But episcopal registers should, of course, be studied not only as illustrating personal character. They may be made, in the long series of a single diocese, to explain the nature of ecclesiastical and social changes throughout the ages, to exemplify local differences, and to tell not a little of varying customs, in tales even of passion, of piety, and of public service. It might be supposed that episcopal registers would give insight into ecclesiastical scandals, and so, to some extent, they do. But Bishops do not tell of clerical disputes or offences for the sake of telling them. It is perhaps true that clerics are even more fond of revealing the faults of clergymen than they are of denouncing those of the laity, whereas laymen are more fond of telling the peccadilloes of the clergy than of recording their own. But though in the making of episcopal registers both bishops and lawyers are concerned, the books are no *chroniques scandaleuses*. In Archbishop Parker's register no one need expect to find scandal about Queen Elizabeth, or, indeed, about anybody else. Those who read the register will only rarely be amused or excited; but they will continually come across new and interesting matter to illustrate the religious, social, and sometimes the political history of England. Let us take, then, the work of Queen Elizabeth's first primate as an example of this class of document, and incidentally of the work done by the Canterbury and York Society.

The register, which is one of the treasures of the Archbishop's library at Lambeth, is bound in two

volumes. The first, a large thick book, possibly in the original leather binding (or more likely, as Dr Jenkins has said, rebound under Sancroft or Tenison) with fine boss on the upper cover, has at the end the date November 1571. The manuscript contains a coloured drawing of the arms of Archbishop Parker, and has some good initial letters. The second, a thinner volume, less elaborately decorated, and certainly never rebound, ends on October 1575, the last entry being the probate of the will of Anne Layne, Aug. 4 of that year. Both books have silver clasps. The registrar whose name occurs early in the first volume, John Incent, remains registrar till the end, though Huse wrote the critical, early, portion.

The first and most obvious note is that of continuity. Whatever may be said about the theology of the Elizabethan Church of England, or the opinions of its clergy, there is no doubt whatever about the continuity of its lawyers. Dr Henry Gee, in a well-known and important book, which in spite of criticisms triumphantly holds the field, has shown how large was the proportion of clergy who continued to hold their benefices from the time of the Marian reaction through the Elizabethan settlement with its Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. Has there ever been a question as to the continuance of the lay officials? Whether the clergy believed in the continuity of the English Church or not, there is no doubt at all that the lawyers did. The lay and legal officials continued their work, *alterata religione*, as the phrase of the time said, and with such comparatively small changes as the absence of 'Romanensian' phraseology from their vocabulary involved, on the old lines, according to the old rules, and in the old language. To the lawyers, at this, as elsewhere at more revolutionary periods, an Amurath an Amurath succeeds, and there is no difference between a Parker and a Pole. There was certainly no more disturbance in legal circles in the 16th century when the Pope disappeared from the horizon than in the 17th when Charles I died on the scaffold; indeed there was less. There is no revolutionary change in the registers of the Archbishop of Canterbury when Pole was succeeded by Parker. As in the greater, so in the smaller things. In Parker's register as on the first page the election and

consecration of the Archbishop are summarily recorded, so as a footnote to the register it is stated that Anthony Huse, the chief registrar, who was chief registrar at the time, died six months later and was succeeded by John Incent. The same handwriting found in marginal notes is found also in the register of Pole. Similarly, among the other legal officials—though it is no longer necessary, as it was at the beginning of Archbishop Peckham's register, to constitute an Italian proctor for pledging the annual payment of forty shillings to proctors at the Court of Rome—the letters patent of Royal Assent are signed 'Ha: Cordell,' a scion, no doubt, of the legal family of which Sir William Cordell, Master of the Rolls, was the head—a man famous in Oxford tradition for securing a pacific settlement between a College and the kin of its Founder, 'partly by pious persuasion and partly by judicious delays.'

So then the register begins: with the title, recording the election by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury under licence of the Crown, the consecration by four bishops, Anthony Huse, esquire, being registrar, with the footnote as to the registrar's death and successor, and the further note: '*Dictus Reverendissimus Mattheus Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis xvi<sup>i</sup> die mensis Maij anno domini 1575 in aurora apud Lambeth mortem obiit et diem suum clausit extremum.*' Thus headed, the register begins after the customary fashion with the Acts of the Confirmation of Parker, Archbishop elect, Dec. 9, 1559; the Letters Patent of the Royal Assent to the election; which contain a special clause, supplementing, by royal authority, any possible defects of legal status; the proxies of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury and of the Archbishop elect; the 'citation' against opposers, and the like; going back to Aug. 1 in the '*Processus Electionis*,' which again quotes the earlier documents authorising the election. The length—dare one say, tediousness?—of all these documents, truly legal in their verbosity, the preciseness, the ancient terminology, are proofs of the care with which precedents were followed. There is no novelty or revolution about the matter. The archiepiscopal see is vacant '*per obitum bonæ memoriæ Reverendissimi in Christo patris et domini Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis ultimi Archiepiscopi et pastoris*

ejusdem.' The legal forms are followed, and here and there touches of personal pedantry on the part of an official reveal themselves. Novelty appears only with the 'juramentum de agnoscendo Supremam potestatem regiam'; and even this is not wholly new, nor even (in the modern sense of the word) wholly Protestant, for did not Edmund Bonner and Nicholas Heath, consecrated, on April 4, 1540, to be Bishops of London and Rochester respectively, take oath, by the help of God, all saints and the holy Evangelists, that they would 'accepte, repute and take the Kynge's majestie to be thonly supream hedde in earthe of the Church of Englande,' and were they not consecrated with all the rites and ceremonies of old, 'more ecclesie Anglicane,' but with 'juramento de renunciando romano Pontifice et eius usurpate Iurisdictioni'? Indeed, Parker's oath was not so strong; for Elizabeth did not claim, as her father did, and her sister, too, for a while, to be Supreme Head of the Church of England. This was how Parker swore :

'I Matthewe Parker elected Archbusshopp of Canto<sup>r</sup> do vtterlie testefie and declare in my Conscience, That the Quenys Highnes ys thonlie Supreme Gouverno<sup>r</sup> of thys Realme and of all other her Highnes Dominions and Contreys, as well in Spirituall or ecclesiasticall thinges or causes, as Temporall, And that no forreine Prince, person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superioritie, Preeminence, or Authoritie ecclesiasticall or Spirituall within thys Realme. And therefore I doe vtterlie renounce and forsake all forreine Jurisdiccions, Powers, Superiorities, and Authorities. And do promise that from Hensforth, I shall beare faith and true Allegyaunce to the Quenys Highnes, her Heires and lawfull Successours, and to my Power shall assist and defend all Jurisdiccions, Priuileges, Preeminences and Authorities graunted or Belonginge to the Quenys Highnes her Heires and Successours or united and annexed to themperiall Crowne of thys Realme. So helpe me God, and by the Contentes of thys Booke.'

After all this comes the 'Ordo Ceremoniarum in consecratione Domini Matthei Parker,' Dec. 17, 1559. It is well known, and explicit is its record, descending even to the details of the position of the altar in Lambeth manor chapel, its decoration, the position of the chairs

placed for the consecrators, and the faldstool, the dress of the Archbishop elect and of the consecrating bishops, the nature of the sermon which John Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, now elect of Hereford, *non ineléganter concionabatur*, the characteristic points of the service, with its English words at the laying on of hands by the four bishops, who all said :

“Take the Hollie gost and remember that thow stirre vpp the grace of God, which ys in the by Imposicion of Handes, for God hath not given vs the Spirite of Feare, But of Power and Love and Sobrenes.” Hiis dictis, Biblia Sacra [Fo. 10<sup>v</sup>] illi in manibus tradiderunt, hujusmodi apud eum verba habentes. “Gyve hede vnto thy readinge, exhortacion and Doctrine, thinke vppon thes thinges, conteyned in thys Booke, be diligent in them that the Increase comminge therbie may be manifest vnto all men. Take hede vnto thy Self, and vnto Thy Teachinge, and be diligent in Doinge them, for by doinge thys thow shalt save thy self and them that hear thee through Jesus Christe our Lord.”

All this has often been quoted. Whatever inferences may be drawn from all this, the facts, since Lingard accepted them at least, have not till recently been in dispute. The old story of the sham consecration in a tavern has long ago been discredited, or has remained only in the conversation of ecclesiastical wits. It used to be said in Oxford, not so many years ago, that a popular papal representative, who lived in a fine house and kept a fine table, would invite undergraduates to dinners at which the *pièce de résistance* was Nag's Head. But historians for a long while had been of one mind. To them the facts seemed plain enough, and inferences might be drawn by contending theologians as they willed.

In 1922, a serious attempt was made to dispute what had been accepted as proved. Mgr Arthur Stapylton Barnes, Domestic Prelate to Pope Benedict XV, in a 'study of the original documents' entitled 'Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders,' asserted—it was only part of the argument of his book—that all this matter, the leaves 3 to 109, were 'the copy of a Register all engrossed at one time not a true Register at all; '\* in other words, that it was a later forgery, inserted by the direction of

\* 'Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders,' p. 124.



Elizabeth's ecclesiastical and political advisers, in order to affirm that the consecration of Parker conformed to what were considered to be certain essential theological conditions of validity. This view depends for its success largely on technical details which it were tedious to discuss at length. It was not accepted by another eminent Roman Catholic writer, Fr Herbert Thurston, S.J.\* The details of penmanship and ink and the size of the quires do not support but rather oppose Mgr Barnes's contention.†

Why should there have been a forgery at all? We are driven back, by the learned controversialist who makes this suggestion, if not upon the Nag's Head story, upon something akin to it. If Parker was not consecrated schismatically and uncanonically by unsatisfactory persons in a public-house, his consecration in the ancient chapel of the Archbishops of Canterbury on their manor of Lambeth was, none the less, no consecration at all, because it was performed by a person who was not a Bishop. It is well known that the record of William Barlow's consecration to the bishopric of St David's (which should be in Cranmer's register) is not to be found. But this is also the case with regard to no less than seven other bishops. In those cases, as in that of Barlow, the evidence of consecration must be obtained from secular sources. These have been exhaustively examined‡ and produce an accumulation of acceptance of Barlow as Bishop of St David's which render it unlikely to the verge of impossibility that he had never been consecrated. Mgr Barnes regards the assumption that he had been consecrated as the result of elaborate plans of Henry VIII to foist an unconsecrated man upon the Church which he was 'reforming,' in order to prove (apparently to himself, for no one else was to know it, at least publicly) that he could do what he liked with *Ecclesia Anglicana*. If this were so, we naturally ask, was Cranmer deceived or was he *particeps criminis* with the King? He could hardly have been the former.

\* See 'The Month,' July 1922 and Jan. 1923.

† See Prof. Claude Jenkins, Lambeth Librarian, in 'The Journal of Theological Studies,' October 1922, vol. xxiv, No. 93.

‡ By Prof. Claude Jenkins, as above.

He would certainly have asked, when Barlow appeared in Convocation and in Parliament as Bishop of St David's, a question like that of Charles Wesley:

‘How easily are Bishops made  
By man or woman’s whim;  
Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid;  
But who laid hands on him?’

Who laid hands on Barlow, if not Cranmer himself? If no one did, the Archbishop must have not only omitted to consecrate a man elected to a Bishopric, but also, during the rest of his archiepiscopal life, have allowed the unconsecrated one to perform all episcopal acts, just as the Chapter of St David's installed him, giving him, as contemporary evidence shows, the bishop's stall, and the dean's stall, in their cathedral church, a necessary consequence of his consecration to the see. The Chapter of St David's were engaged in a squabble with Barlow, and they threatened him ‘to spend to ther shertes in the quarrell.’ It is not at all likely that they could be ignorant that he had not been consecrated, for they would not have installed him without the necessary evidence of consecration. And, if they knew it, is it likely that they would fail to use as a weapon against his claims, the fact that he had not been consecrated, and had therefore no right over them at all? It is true that Mgr Barnes quotes Archbishop Warham as saying that ‘a man is not made Bishop by consecration,’ but there is no reason to suppose that this was the opinion either of Archbishop Cranmer or of the Chapter of St David's. It may be that the controversy on the question whether Barlow was really consecrated or not will continue to be discussed between Romanists and Anglicans; but for the pure historian it can hardly be considered undecided. The probability that he was consecrated is too strong: the fact that he was always treated, by lawyers and clergy alike, as a bishop is obvious: the arguments against the consecration are based upon a succession of improbabilities and an extravagant supposition of fraud which no unprejudiced critic of evidence is likely to accept. It may be said, to conclude the matter, that the researches of Mgr Barnes and of his critics have brought us much nearer to ascertaining the truth.

We may take it as certain that those who inserted the account of Parker's consecration in his register, the Archbishop's principal registrar, and the two notaries public whose names are given as witnesses, regarded him as duly consecrated. Four bishops took part in the act, Barlow (now elect of Chichester); Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, now elect of Hereford; Coverdale, formerly of Exeter; and Hodgkins, suffragan of Bedford. It was the English custom, though not the Roman,\* that all the consecrators should be Bishops and all the Bishops concerned should be actually consecrators. Thus authorised, Parker proceeded to act as Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England; and the rest of his register is concerned with his acts as such. He appointed proctors for his installation according to the rules and customs of the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of Canterbury. He then proceeded to perform all the spiritual and legal acts necessary for the consecration or enthronement, as the case may be, of Bishops to London (vacant *per destitutionem et deprivationem Edmundi Bonner*), Ely, Hereford, Bangor, Worcester, Chichester, Salisbury, Lincoln, St David's, St Asaph, Rochester, Coventry and Lichfield, Bath and Wells, Exeter, Norwich, Winchester, Peterborough, and York, St Asaph (in place of the Bishop in 1561 translated to St David's), St David's, Gloucester, Llandaff (where the Marian Bishop, Kitchin, had remained till his death), Bangor (again), Oxford (on the death of Robert King *bone memorie*, who was the last abbot of Osney). This last was a translation of Archbishop Hugh Curwen of Dublin (who had been consecrated by Bonner and two others in 1555, when the See of Canterbury was vacant). And then the suffragan Bishop of Dover. This brings us down to May 1569.

The register, as we have seen already, is not strictly chronological though it is continuous. We have for the most part all the documents, of whatever date, relating to a particular vacancy or consecration, placed together. The registrar supplied the detailed documents, but the clerks waited till the matter was complete before inserting them. In this manner we have in 1570 the vacancies of

---

\* See 'Liber Pontificalis,' I. 303 (consecration of Pelagius in 556).

Chichester, York, London, Rochester, Worcester, Lincoln, Exeter, stretching on, in the new style, to 1571: then 1571, Salisbury and Rochester. Then a list of the vacancies of sees during Parker's archiepiscopate, with deeds of institution to benefices by the Archbishop during these periods, interspersed with some very delightful wills (among which one notices the best feather bed with a bolster and a pair of blankets bequeathed to the eldest son, but nothing said of the second best). Interesting points are the restitution of incumbents who had been unjustly or illegally deprived under Mary; the investigation of the legality of a marriage (the result being reported to the Queen); institutions; sequestrations (for non-residence and neglect of duty); commission to visit (diocese of Bangor 1566); monition and citation for non-residence (Morison or Moris of Henley on Thames), followed by deprivation for disobedience thereto; certificates of excommunication, and order for the apprehension of the excommunicate; dispensations to hold benefices notwithstanding defect of age, and licence to delay ordination, for purpose of study; commissions to bishops to ordain on behalf of the Archbishop; licence to the Archbishop of York to confirm and consecrate his suffragans within the province of Canterbury; decision of the right of his chancellor to allow marriage within the prohibited seasons; the very curious case of Mr Southwell and Lady Mary Howard, one of the maidens of honour—were they married, or pledged to marry?—which they utterly denied, and the Queen, we know, was extremely indignant at any approach to marriage of her maidens without her consent; equally curious admission of a midwife, wherein the woman (besides much more serious things) was made to swear not to baptize 'in rose or damask water, or water made of any confection or mixture'; licence to teach grammar; absolution for marriage in a private house without banns; the almost obsolete grant, so common under Henry VIII, of a corrody (in the hospital at Harbaldowne); and licence to the vicar of Boxley to marry an approved widow. We have now got so far as folio 298 of the register. Later years follow the examples of the earlier. We find a dispensation to hold a benefice at the age of sixteen, on condition that clerical dress is

worn and the scholar be ordained deacon at twenty-one and priest at twenty-four.

Thus, summarily, we survey the area of the Archbishop's activities. Most of these matters may seem trivial. More important are the Visitations, and the articles of enquiry. These for the most part are to be sought for elsewhere than in the register; but we may single out for brief notice, from the register itself, the cases of Canterbury Cathedral and Merton College, Oxford. At Canterbury, in 1560, the Archbishop's Visitation was conducted by commissioners, Yale, Leedes, Nevinson, and Nowell (the last the person from whose case the decision against clergy sitting in the Commons depends). The Injunctions require *inter alia* the defacing of 'certain verses both wicked and slanderous, painted when Thomas Beckitt, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, was wont to be honoured.' They are signed by Parker, and there is a letter in his register covering the document. In 1570 he began the Visitation in person, and his Injunctions show most careful and minute consideration of the details, defects, and needs of cathedral life: so again even more minutely in 1573-4. In the last case some contentions arose because the Archbishop seemed to insist on observance of points of the Henrician statutes, e.g. the *maiores canonici* celebrating *divina . . . in majoribus diebus festis, quod duplices appellant*. The canons demurred because it was not set down in the Prayer Book what the double feasts were. With regard to the Oxford College the same minute care was shown. As in cathedrals there were obnoxious and quarrelsome canons, major and minor, so in colleges there were obstinate and disorderly dons. Deans and Heads were more decent folk, and Parker supported their authority. At Merton in 1562 Parker visited in person, majestically and effectively. He issued Injunctions again in 1567; and finally in 1569 a Royal Commission concluded the troubles. These matters may be studied in detail in the register.

To the end Parker was most active in visiting himself and causing the bishops of his province to visit, that primary duty of the *episcopus*, the overseer. The details of this work belong to the history of the country: so do the famous Advertisements of 1566. The history of

this latter document may be traced in Parker's voluminous correspondence; and the conclusion, after years of controversy, now seem to be reached, that the Advertisements merely imposed a minimum of observance upon a reluctant or negligent clergy.

It might be expected that the register of an Elizabethan primate would contain not a few references to the politics of the day as well as the formalities of Church law and custom. The times indeed were tangled. Parker had enough to do as archbishop without combining with the care of the Church the functions of Chancellor, as did Morton half a century before him. Still the 'bowsprit got mixed with the rudder sometimes,' and the Archbishop's duties were not wholly ecclesiastical. The wonder is, perhaps, that they were such in so overwhelming preponderance as the register shows. Parker certainly kept out of action that was not strictly that of a primate so far as he possibly could. Yet his register shows him ordering a view of armour to be provided by the clergy according to the proportion and rate prescribed and used in the time of the reigns of the late King Philip and Queen Mary, while it also shows the Queen from time to time intruding, as her ancestors had done from time to time, in what the Church would not consider her proper business. It would be difficult to say that she intruded further than did several mediæval monarchs.

As Archbishop, Parker lived indeed a difficult life. He was beset on four sides. There was the Queen, imperious and irritable, sensitive and inquisitive, but with a definite and determined policy of ruling her own realm in her own way and making all, clerk and lay, rich and poor, submit. It is probable that beneath all her vagaries she was in religious matters of one mind with Parker: to stand in the old ways yet to see that the ways were well lighted and free from obstructions. Unquestionably she had, as she said, 'the heart and stomach of a man.' Not always so, her ministers. Perhaps they saw the difficulties more clearly than she did; certainly they were more inclined to fear them than she was. Thus we trace a worrying and vacillating attitude toward Church questions in the ministers which cannot really be attributed to the Queen. Up to



1570 she would go far in conciliation; she would not definitely break with the Pope, still less with those of her subjects who sympathised with him. Conciliation, she thought, would bring them to acquiesce in the new service forms and the absence of Papalism, and to go to church regularly, and say their prayers for the Queen, as did that honest and generous merchant, Sir Thomas White, to whose bold action when he was Lord Mayor Queen Mary may well have felt that she owed her crown. There were many like him. But there were also the Puritan recusants and the Romish recusants, and, unlike Queen and ministers, neither of these gave Parker their confidence. The marvel is that he steered his way so skilfully between them. Letters, Injunctions, Advertisements, reflect the troubles. Only in the Register do we see something like a calm undisturbed progress. It might almost be said that the real results of the reign can be traced best in the Register. Even when the Queen was excommunicated and deposed, and she and her ministers became convinced that Romanism meant treason, and when officials of the Church as well as State were forced into the combat, the routine of Church life went on, and the settlement, begun when the Archbishop was consecrated, survived.

It was patience which won the day. Parker would go some way in denouncing Popery and mediævalism, but he adhered without doubt or hesitation to what he believed to be ancient, primitive, Catholic. A special dress for the officiating minister must be retained; what it was, cope or surplice, did not so much matter. Chalices might be transformed into communion cups, but (that it should be seen that no lack of reverence would be allowed) wafer bread should be required. In doctrine he refused elaborate definition. Like Laud he would not allow that any opinion, 'the denial of the foundation alone excepted,' could shut the meanest out of heaven. His close friend Guest explained that a new definition did not 'exclude the presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament but only the grossness and sensibleness of the receiving thereof'; and the doctrine should be explained by the sermons of the Early English Church, before the Norman days; 'it is naturally corruptible Bread and Wine, and is by the might of God's Word truly Christ's Body and

His blood.' Parker might have written Charles Wesley's hymns which declared the 'Real Presence here.' Elizabeth's wise Archbishop understood the meaning of reaction, but he looked beyond it to an established peace. It was very long in coming; partisans could not believe (any more than they do now) that it would ever come. But Parker in his sagacious calmness set an example which his wisest successors have consistently followed.

Parker died on May 17, 1575. What was his character? Could he have been better described by anticipation, on the day when Elizabeth and Cecil sought him out and overcame his genuine and deep-seated reluctance to accept the weighty charge they had determined to give him, than in the words Shakespeare makes Wolsey say of the appointment of More as Chancellor:

'That's somewhat sudden;  
But he's a learned man. May he continue  
Long in his highness' favour, and do justice  
For truth's sake and his conscience; that his bones,  
When he has run his course and sleeps in blessings,  
May have a tomb of orphans' tears wept on 'em.'

Parker well deserved such a prayer, and he achieved such a blessing. One of the deeply learned primates—they have not been very numerous—he was just and a truth lover, a man of sensitive conscience and generosity. Perhaps he was not a great man, but he did greater work than often great men do. Was Parker a statesman or a politician? Not the latter certainly in the sense in which not a few of the ecclesiastics of his century were politicians. It is true that in England there was no such persistent tradition of political action as there was in France and Italy. English prelates did not lead parties or dictate secular policies, at least after the Reformation. Wolsey, we have often been told, was the last of our ecclesiastical statesmen: he was also a politician, one who dealt with current problems in an opportunist spirit as well as in a manner statesman-like and broad. Cranmer made scarce any attempt to be a statesman, but he hardly escaped the temptations and failures of a politician. No taint of political craft tarnishes the purity of Parker's aims. He attached

himself to no minister's favour; he walked among them as an equal, untouched by their intrigues. As a statesman, however, he may indeed claim to be considered among the makers of English history. The Elizabethan settlement of religion was a work of consummate statesmanship. Dr S. R. Gardiner said that it was a vindication of Laud's principles that on the lines he laid down the Church of England endures to the present day. This is at least as true of Parker. It is possible that not a little of what has been attributed to Elizabeth and Cecil may really be due to the wise and sober statesmanship of their Archbishop. Certainly he seems, as we look at him to-day, to be the very personification of the *Via Media*. And when Bishop Creighton said that the ultimate principle of the English Reformation was its appeal to sound Learning, he could hardly have found a more convincing exponent of that view than in the scholar and antiquary who succeeded Pole in the seat of Augustine. The business of his long life—he died in his seventy-first year—was a work of conciliation. He had to bear witness to the continuous things of faith and life during a period both reformatory and iconoclastic. Like all good rulers he knew that the very beginning of wisdom is the desire of discipline: yet he knew too that there is a greater force to make men, and states, wise unto their salvation. 'Execution of laws and order,' he said to Cecil, 'must be the first and last part in good governance, although I yet admit moderations for times, places, multitudes.' 'Tandem hic quiescit,' says the stone in the chapel of his palace at Lambeth: he worked for peace and he achieved it in faith and hope. To the rebuilding of a great institution after disorder and revolution many graces are necessary, but the greatest of these is charity. And that was the abiding grace of Matthew Parker.

W. H. HUTTON.

## Art. 12.—THE REAL NAVAL INCUBUS.

In the British nation as a whole there still abides the deep-rooted knowledge that our heritage rests on sea power, but to-day there is a very natural desire on the part of the individual taxpayer for relief from his financial burdens. These two influences combine to produce a popular demand for 'efficiency with economy' in the conduct of our naval affairs.

At the outset we are faced with the fact that the post-war fleet has begun to decay. Other nations have been building steadily within the limitations of the Washington Agreement, while our relative standard of strength has been falling year by year. For six years after the Armistice we did not lay down a single cruiser. So serious was the position becoming that even the anti-militarist Labour Government sanctioned the construction of five 10,000-ton warships.

With the return of a Conservative Government pledged to economy and the installation of their last joined recruit, Mr Winston Churchill, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, the claims of the Admiralty to continue a programme of replacing ships already nearly worn out and too small for their work, clashed violently with the policy of retrenchment, and something like a naval crisis was brewing. However, good sense prevailed. The 'new broom' at the Treasury found that the urgent claims of the Service which he had done so much to build up in years gone by, could not be lightly discarded. He became less adamant. The Naval Lords showed that they were fully alive to the necessity for reducing national expenditure.

So the Cabinet sanctioned a five-years' programme of new construction, which the Admiralty considered satisfactory. The Board, on their part, undertook to effect reductions in other directions which would offset the cost of accelerating this programme.

Since then drastic economies have been devised, with the result that the First Lord, in his Estimates for 1926, has been able to show a saving of 2,400,100*l.* on those for the previous year, while the provision for new construction has actually been increased by nearly two

millions. The following are the principal items amongst these economies:

(a) The four 'Iron Dukes' are being withdrawn from the Mediterranean battle fleet and, with reduced complements, will be used for training boys in Home waters.

(b) The Second Light Cruiser Squadron has been reduced from five ships to four.

(c) A number of depôt ships and tenders to Harbour Training Establishments have been paid off.

(d) One of the Atlantic destroyer flotillas has been reduced to reserve.

(e) Three light cruisers, five depôt ships, and eighteen destroyers have been placed on the disposal list; four battleships and fifteen more destroyers will join them in the course of the ensuing year.

(f) Five large submarines have been scrapped.

(g) Complements of ships have been closely scrutinised and changes tending to economy made where possible.

(h) A policy of slowing down accumulation of reserves of stores and fuel has been adopted.

(i) Rosyth and Pembroke Dockyards and the Coastal Motor Boat Base at Haslar have been closed.

It can be stated categorically that practically every one of these economies has emanated from the naval side of the Admiralty, very largely as the result of the energetic labours of the Naval Staff for the past nine months. Furthermore, it can be asserted that neither the Colwyn Committee nor the civil departments of the Admiralty have played any part in initiating the majority of them. All these reductions in the sea-going fleet and in naval establishments, it should be noted, are additional to the sweeping economies on the Navy during the years immediately after the war and the wholesale scrapping of ships as the result of the Washington Agreement.

The comparative strength of the Navy in 1914 and in 1926 is also instructive. In the former year the personnel numbered 151,000; provision is made in this year's Estimates for 102,675. The effective strength of the various classes of fighting ships were and are as follows:

	1914	1926
Battleships . . . . .	62	18
Battle-cruisers . . . . .	10	4
Aircraft carriers * (over 10,000 tons) . . . . .	Nil	6
Cruisers (all classes) . . . . .	127	47
Flotilla leaders . . . . .	3	17
Destroyers . . . . .	218	172
Torpedo-boats . . . . .	70	Nil
Submarines . . . . .	76	56
Total . . . . .	566	320

In the light of these figures it is not unnatural to look for an appreciable reduction in the size of the Admiralty Office. It is a little disconcerting, therefore, to find that the cost has increased from 483,000*l.* in 1914 to 1,220,000*l.* in the 1926 Estimates. But, before condemning such increase as wholly unjustifiable, it is necessary to differentiate between that part of the machinery of Admiralty which must be maintained in readiness for war, and that part which is required for the administration of the fleet at peace strength.

In the forefront of the first category comes the Naval Staff. Before the war this was not properly developed, otherwise we might have been spared some terrible blunders in our war policy and strategy. Failure to use the sea power we possessed to prevent the sinews of war flowing into enemy countries, the tragedy of Coronel, the muddle of the Dardanelles, are some of the failures which have been attributed to the meddling interference of civilians—Ministers, diplomats, and politicians. Whether such blame is warranted or not, it is obvious that the influence of amateur strategists, however powerful, can be neutralised, to a large extent, if there exists a plan, properly thought out and set out by the professional heads of the Fighting Services. Again and again, in the late war, such plans were lacking. This was partly due to the Cabinet having no clear major policy, partly to lack of co-operation between civil Ministers and the naval and military Chiefs, but also, so far as the Navy was concerned, very largely to the lack of a fully equipped and properly organised

\* Including two cruisers under reconstruction as aircraft carriers.



Naval Staff. The naval element at the Admiralty was, for the most part, swamped with routine work, and the Staff, whose business it was to think out the problems of war, was undermanned and mostly untrained.

If the 'war brain' of the Navy is starved, the highest efficiency of personnel and *matériel* may not avail when war comes. The comparatively small additional expense of an adequate Naval Staff has not only enabled the recent very great economies to be made with a minimum loss of efficiency, but should go far to save the Empire from a repetition of tragic blunders and panic measures, costing millions in lives and money.

That 'brain' must always be the pick of those officers who, in war, will have to see their schemes put into practice; no other type of mentality has the necessary training; in no other way can there be proper responsibility. There is no room in this section of the Admiralty for the unprofessional element, except, perchance, for the civilian scientist acting in an advisory capacity. Even the clerical work should be done by those who understand the subject matter, as opposed to those to whom it is only so many numbered memoranda, files, jackets, or packs.

It is all the more surprising, therefore, to find here, at the first stage in Admiralty organisation, that a large staff of civil servants is engaged in handling papers of an essentially naval character, dealing with highly specialist subjects such as plans, operations, and intelligence. 'M' Branch, as it is called, provides the whole of the clerical personnel for the Naval Staff. It is a Civil Service Principal Assistant Secretary (Staff), or one of his subordinates, who drafts orders affecting the movements of the fleet, and who signs them in the name of the Board. In war-time such a system may be fraught with danger, for the naval officer reads, but often does not write, what goes forth to the fleet, while the uncomprehending scribe may elude the vigilance of the former and bring about disaster.

Mr Winston Churchill in his 'The World Crisis'\* gives the account of a 'regrettable incident' which occurred in this very Branch, and which had lamentable consequences.

---

\* 'The World Crisis, 1911-1914,' pp. 255-6.

'At 1 a.m. on Aug. 8 [1914],' he writes, 'Sir Berkeley Milne, having collected . . . his three battle-cruisers at Malta, set out at a moderate speed on an easterly course in pursuit of the "Goeben." At this juncture the Fates moved a blameless and punctilious Admiralty clerk to declare war upon Austria. The code telegram ordering hostilities to be commenced against Austria was inadvertently released without any authority whatever. The mistake was repaired a few hours later; but the first message reached Sir Berkeley Milne. . . . His original orders had prescribed that in the event of war with Austria he should . . . concentrate near Malta, and, faithful to these instructions, he turned his ships about and desisted from the pursuit of the "Goeben." Twenty-four hours were thus lost before orders could reach him to resume it.'

The 'Goeben' escaped, and, as Mr Churchill puts it, 'the Curse descended irrevocably upon Turkey and the East.'

Many years previously, that great First Sea Lord, Admiral Sir Frederick Richards, wanted to have this Branch of the Admiralty manned entirely by a naval personnel, but (the story goes) the then Secretary of the Admiralty lunched with the then Secretary of the Treasury, and the former afterwards informed Sir Frederick that his wish could not be resisted, but that other projects which he had at heart could and would be. The First Sea Lord was a diplomatist and therefore chose the lesser evil, although the change was really needed in the interests of the safety of the State.

The incident, whether exact in its details or not, illustrates clearly the position of the civil servants at the Admiralty. Instead of owing full allegiance to the Board, their virtual chief is the Secretary to the Treasury, who is practically the head of the Civil Service. The effect of this, at the present juncture, is that My Lords, instead of being in the position of Managing Directors who can cut their civil staff to conform with the volume of business, are in that of a Manager, whose Directors have compelled him to dismiss a number of his industrial workers and close down several of his factories, but who is prohibited from economising on his office staff, because all its members have powerful vested interests.

So we see these drastic naval reductions—ships scrapped, some 1800 officers and 18,000 men retired, per-

force, whole departments of the war-time Naval Staff abolished—yet the same names as before, occasionally with new titles, appearing at the head of the list of the Secretariat.

On the civil side of the Admiralty Office, only the unfortunate under-dog—the temporary clerk, the messenger, and the charwoman—is ‘economised’ out of the building. While there has been a reduction in the cost of practically every naval department at the Admiralty, including the Naval Staff, except those directly concerned with the new programme of construction, as between the 1925 and 1926 Estimates, there has actually been an increase from the already high figure of 74,817*l.* in the former year to 75,060*l.* this year in the cost of the Secretary’s department. Little wonder that the economist and the naval officer are at one in very natural indignation at the apparent inability to reduce this incubus of civil expenditure which hangs round the neck of the Sea Service. The reason why the Board of Admiralty has not been able to reduce the Navy’s overhead charges, in this respect, will, however, be better understood when we realise the extent to which the Civil Service rules in that office.

The Coalition Government made the Secretary to the Admiralty a member of the Board on the grounds that he had financial responsibility. Apart from the fact that, as will be seen later, he is only a cog in the complicated machine which controls the Navy’s finance, this was a thoroughly unsound step, for it means that the Secretary and his department, whose functions should be mainly those of clerical assistants to the Board, are, far too often, in the position of being masters.

The political, like the naval, members of the Board are, comparatively speaking, temporary ‘Directors’; the civil servant is part of the permanent machinery, but that is no reason why the ‘machine’ should override the hands which are intended to direct it; yet, in financial matters, we find the power of the civil servant is undisguised and overwhelming. In other ways his influence in naval affairs is more insidious than obvious.

Between the Treasury and the Secretarial and financial departments of the Admiralty there is not merely close

liaison, but overlapping and duplication of work to an extent which means an unjustifiable waste of public time and money. The whole system of Admiralty finance is so complicated and dilatory, so bound up in regulations and red tape, so hedged around by high-salaried officials, that it actually creates unnecessary expense and often precludes economies where they might otherwise be effected. The following is typical of how Admiralty business is conducted:

1. A naval department makes a proposal involving unforeseen expense.

2. The Naval Lord in charge approves the proposal in principle, as being really necessary for efficiency, but he has no means of finding the wherewithal to meet it.

3. It goes to a branch of the Secretariat. From there it is probably returned to the naval department for further information to enlighten the civil staff, who do not understand what it means or entails.

4. In due course it reaches the Accountant-General's Department, probably with some comment of no material value. Here there is more questioning, and after being bandied from one section to another, it is eventually sent to the Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Duties. This office appears to have been created largely to provide additional promotion in the Civil Service, and the holder has been interposed between the Accountant-General and the Treasury to act as the latter's watchdog. In his hands the unfortunate proposal may meet with premature extinction, the death warrant taking the form of some such phrase as 'The Treasury inform me that no funds are available for this purpose'; or it may be sent to the Inquisition of the Finance Committee.

5. This Finance Committee is presided over by the Financial Secretary (the Parliamentary member of the Board). Supporting him are most or all of the following civil members—the Civil Lord, the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Finance, and the Accountant-General—while a solitary naval member, perhaps the Third Sea Lord, Controller of the Navy, sits with them justifying the needs of his department in gross and in detail.

6. This does not end the matter, for the work of the Finance Committee is not infrequently done all over

again by another lot of high-salaried officials at the Treasury, even more ignorant of naval needs, and before whom their naval advocate is not able to appear. Here, the Admiralty civil servant alone can assist to further or frustrate the requirements of the Service.

The whole position of the Naval Lords in this matter of finance is most humiliating and in the national interest thoroughly unsound. It is based on the principle, condemned root and branch by the Esher Committee over twenty years ago, that the professional officer is devoid of business capacity. Paragraph after paragraph of that report might be quoted verbatim as applying to the Admiralty of to-day, but a few extracts must suffice. Criticising the War Office system of finance, the Report says : \*

‘ . . . it has its origin in a distant past (and) is based upon the assumption that all military officers are necessarily spend-thrifts and that their actions must be controlled in gross and in detail by civilians. This theory is largely responsible for unreadiness for war as well as for reckless and wasteful expenditure.’

Further : †

‘ There can be no doubt that in proportion as officers are accustomed to financial responsibilities, the economy, which they alone can secure, will be effected. While the present system of financial control is futile in peace, it is ruinous in war.’

The Esher Committee also called attention to : ‡

‘ . . . the control of military policy by the civil branches of the office. . . . We desire to repeat that the criticism of military policy by civilians, whose functions should be limited to examination of estimates, cost, and expenditure, has become a habit, incurable unless drastic reforms are applied. . . .’

These drastic reforms were applied and, when recommending them, the Committee laid down § the basic principle that :

‘ Each Member [of the Army Council] should . . . have

---

\* Report of the War Office (Reconstitution) Committee, 1904, Part II, p. 15.

† Ibid., p. 16.

‡ Ibid., p. 16.

§ Ibid., p. 16.

full control of his own votes, the Estimates being so arranged as to show clearly for what sums each is responsible.'

The Committee also expressed the opinion that:

'... Departmental finance is not the master but the hand-maid of administration.'

And:\*

'... the power of finding available funds when a policy is favoured and of suggesting financial difficulties in other cases should certainly *not* be wielded by the Accountant-General's Branch.'

The mal-administration of the War Office during the Boer War provoked a storm of abuse which eventually brought about much-needed reforms. The Admiralty system, on the other hand, has evaded the same fierce light of criticism, for, in the Great War, financial control was necessarily relaxed under pressure of dire necessity. Since the war, however, the old system has been reverted to and its defects have been accentuated by a greatly over-staffed civil branch both at the Admiralty and Treasury.

The office of the Accountant-General of the Navy is a time-honoured one and has been filled by men of outstanding ability and personality, but it is now largely overshadowed by the Secretarial branch and, in effect, some four high-salaried civil servants are sharing what should be one man's responsibility. Nowhere is there so much room for reformation, simplification, and economy as in the administration of the Navy's finances.

Turning to other departments of the Admiralty, we find the Second Sea Lord, who is Chief of Naval Personnel, and the Fourth Sea Lord, who is Chief of Supplies and Transport, hedged in and surrounded on all sides by civil servants.

The former, amongst other things, is concerned with disciplinary questions, which one might reasonably expect would be regarded as essentially the province of naval officers. In practice, however, we find these matters are largely in the hands of two purely civilian

---

\* Report of the War Office (Reconstitution) Committee, 1904, Part II, p. 15, par. 6.



branches known as N. and N.L. (Naval Law). Here civil servants are most wrongly called upon to deal with subjects of which in the nature of things they know little or nothing.

Discipline, to-day more than ever, consists in a wise interpretation of the letter of the law and a close personal understanding of the character of many and various cases requiring its application. With a knowledge of naval personnel gained from nothing more human than official regulations and reports, these civil departments are wont to oppose and criticise the views of senior naval officers with a lifetime's experience of the ranks and ratings they command. Naval Courts Martial, the fairest Courts of justice in the world, constantly have their findings nullified by some legal quibble evolved by a civilian pedagogue in Whitehall. From this cause the equitable administration of naval justice is liable to suffer, and so react unfavourably on the discipline and contentment of naval personnel.

The only safeguard lies in the often over-taxed and isolated Second Sea Lord. If his vigilance relaxes or he is taken off his guard, grave mistakes may be made with results which are liable to be far-reaching and very serious. Here again the Civil Service has usurped the proper functions of the naval officer. These two branches and that known as C.W. (Commissions and Warrants), which has to do with appointments and promotions below Captain's rank, should be mainly naval in character. In other words, the Second Sea Lord should have a predominantly naval instead of a predominantly civil staff to help him administer the personnel of the Navy.

The Fourth Sea Lord is even more isolated amongst civilian departments. Except for a very small personal staff he is surrounded by civil servants. His two chief departments—Naval Stores and Victualling—are entirely civilian. It is true that they are well run, and the Navy has reason to be grateful for the care bestowed on its material requirements and creature comforts by the heads of these departments, for many years past, but as stores and provisions are both the province of the Paymaster Branch at sea, there would seem scope for economy if such naval officers were employed wherever possible to combine these duties in

shore establishments instead of retaining two separate lots of civil officials.

The criticism will at once be raised that all these proposals would involve a large amount of naval personnel being employed on shore to the detriment of their sea training. The answer is that one of the greatest problems of the Navy is to make use of officers who cannot be promoted, through sheer weight of numbers, but who are in other respects thoroughly capable and full of energy. To-day there is a huge list of officers drawing half-pay and pensions while the country is also paying high salaries to a large number of civil servants performing what is really naval work. If these officers were paid the difference between their half-pay or pension and the present Civil Service salaries there would be a great gain both in economy and efficiency.

It is evident that reform is very unlikely to come from within the Admiralty. As in the case of the bad old War Office, it must be brought about by pressure and criticism from without. In short, what is needed is a second 'Esher Committee' who, without fear or favour, will overhaul the whole administrative machinery of the Admiralty, when we may expect to see the following results:

(a) Considerable economy through a number of redundant senior civil servants being pensioned without reliefs, just as redundant senior naval officers were pensioned after the post-war and post-Washington reductions of the fleet.

(b) Further economy and increased efficiency by giving responsible Naval Heads at the Admiralty financial control, within the limits set by Parliament in the annual Estimates, of their own departments. They, and not the Civil Service Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Principal Assistant Secretary, and Accountant-General, would have to 'make both ends meet.' They would have every incentive to effect economies on less important services, and they, and only they, would be able to do so without detriment to efficiency.

(c) Further economy and acceleration of Admiralty business by the elimination of unnecessary civil appointments and duplication of work at the Admiralty and Treasury.

(d) Simplification of financial regulations and procedure.

(e) Purely naval matters, such as plans, operations, intelligence, and discipline; handled by a naval clerical staff recruited from officers passed over for promotion, invalidated but otherwise capable, and officers and men on the pensions list, thereby effecting considerable economy and promoting greater security in naval affairs and the better welfare of naval personnel.

The civil servant at the Admiralty would then have his activities confined to his proper rôle of performing all clerical work, not of an essentially naval character, and of acting as adviser and accountant to the Board in financial matters.

Before concluding, it is only fair to make another quotation from the Esher Report which may be said equally to apply to the Admiralty of to-day. The Committee remarked : \*

'In pointing out the serious drawbacks in the present administration . . . we do not intend to convey any reflexion upon the Members of the Civil Staff who have conscientiously carried out the duties which have arisen through the operation of the false system hitherto existing.'

The Admiralty, and, therefore, the Navy, is suffering from a 'false system' which has given the civil servant undue power and unfitting responsibilities in that office. This results in wasteful and unproductive expenditure, and is detrimental to the efficiency and well-being of the fleet in peace-time, while in war it is a menace to the proper conduct of naval operations.

---

\* Report of the War Office (Reconstitution) Committee, 1904, Part II, p. 17, par. 17.

## SOME RECENT BOOKS.

*Varied Biographies—From Showman to Ecclesiastic—  
Fourteen English Judges—Science and the Modern  
World—The Drama—Beowulf—European Literature—  
Birds—Papua—Siberian Folk Lore.*

IN these days of intrusive paragraphs, persistent interviewers, and social gossip, sometimes tyrannous, nearly everybody who is anybody is assured of his biography. And often, to make the assurance doubly sure, he writes it himself. A goodly proportion of the more readable volumes which come to us are biographical in character; and so catholic of appeal and interest that no class, it seems, need feel neglected. Good roads, good times, and merry tenting! is the farewell wish to his readers of that jolly adventurer, 'Lord' George Sanger (with the self-conferred title which amused Queen Victoria), in '*Seventy Years a Showman*' (Dent). This is a delightful book, especially for the glimpses it gives of an England which—in many ways happily—has passed away. When it is realised that George Sanger's father was wounded on the 'Victory' at Trafalgar, and that the gallant old sailor, discharged with a ten-pound pension, constructed a peepshow and maintained a large family on its proceeds, it is seen that his successful son had a sire of whom he was rightly proud. The true hero of this book is that father; his amazing pluck, ingenuity, self-respect, passion for right, simplicity and piety, described by his son with a reverent affection, comprised an example of moral greatness. Indeed, the chapters showing the roughness of the vagrant's high-road a hundred years ago are most illuminating and attractive; but his 'lordship' must not be overlooked; for his life also was an achievement. Judged by the canons of the market-place, George Sanger was successful; for he realised fortunes, and, better still, deserved them. In his time he could do everything—acrobat, conjuror, rider, animal-tamer, patter-merchant, and *maestro* in the art of advertisement. He originated 'stunts' and improved on those of his rivals. He could venture in the darkness into passages thronged with lions that had escaped, and secure them; while as for

the showman's impudence—his bearded lady, that was a white bear; his oyster, that loved to smoke tobacco; and the crowning venture, when Queen Victoria went to St Paul's to return thanks for the serious illness of the Prince of Wales, and he, with the least possible interval, tacked his own painted, spangled parade on to the royal procession, while the police winked at him. George Sanger enjoyed life, and his book reproduces that enjoyment. There is showmanship elsewhere than in the circus ring, as the first chief of the Salvationists proved. Many volumes have been given to the Booths and their red-jerseyed crusade; almost invariably penned with personal or religious sentimentality or else dark with the statistics of social gloom. It is, therefore, with relief that we read *'Echoes and Memories'* (Hodder & Stoughton) written by the present head of the Salvation Army; for it possesses humour, broad-minded humanity, frankness, and interest. General Bramwell Booth, during his long and serviceable life, has met a number of outstanding people and witnessed memorable incidents, which he has set down in agreeable fashion. Naturally, to his own organisation, 'the Army,' he shows a becoming partiality. He represents the Salvationists during the ugly 'eighties as a host of innocent martyrs, suffering as blameless saints from the persecutions of publicans and sinners; forgetting that the awful cornets and intolerable drums of their untrained bandsmen, blared and banged in the streets, was a challenge to the naughty and virtuous alike; for, indeed, it was an unforgettable nuisance, while the good work of the Army, which has since won wide admiration, had yet to be done. The author's sketches of personalities are admirably written; he shows to the life, for he sees the warts as well as the inspiration, those worth meeting whom he met, beginning with his father, and continuing with Cecil Rhodes, in his kindness of heart; the emotional Stead; a set of the ecclesiastical, their foibles piquantly touched upon—with Manning, 'wily old saint,' prominent amongst them. A happy light is thrown on King Edward, who proved his royal graciousness when, despite iron traditions and the fiat of the Earl Marshal, he permitted General Bramwell Booth to attend his Coronation in Westminster Abbey,

not in the Court costume officially required but in his Salvation uniform.

We pass from the modern evangelists to the other extreme. No biography of any substance had been written about 'Lanfranc' (Oxford University Press), the famous Abbot of Bec who became the Archbishop of Canterbury and an effective colleague and instrument of William the Conqueror, before Mr A. J. Macdonald penned this study of his life, work, and writings. Such omission on the part of historians is curious, in view of the fact that the ages have been ransacked for subjects of biography—murderers as well as suffragan bishops enjoying their volumes—while Lanfranc has been overlooked. Possibly the severity of the task has been the obstacle, for the abundance of references and marginal notes given by Mr Macdonald, in his study, shows how close and exhaustive the necessary researches have been. He has traced the career of one of the greatest men of our history, an Italianate Englishman, who like many other statesmen sent here to maintain and administer the affairs of the Church, took part in the government of the kingdom and ended by being as serviceably patriotic to England as her own native men. Lanfranc, it is clearly shown, was a model of efficiency. Learned in law, an authority in the courts of his time, as well as a scholar, he entered the priesthood in middle age. He endeavoured not to reveal his lay record; but efficiency would out, and preferment necessarily came to him. Obviously, a flesh-and-blood character cannot easily be drawn of this statesman-ecclesiastic who flourished at the time of the Conquest; but, indirectly, Mr Macdonald reveals his dominating personality, and illustrates the wit and courage through which, when brought into antagonism with the mighty and resolute William, he conquered the Conqueror.

Social reform is the main link connecting Lanfranc with the next book; the excellently frank, autobiographical 'My Apprenticeship' (Longmans), which Mrs Beatrice Webb has written. Nominally an explanation of her drift towards, and methods of realising, social investigation as her life-work, it is more than that; as besides analysing the political and religious unrest of the later years of the last century, she points with



delicate truth and irony the big and the little people she happened to meet. Except for the 'Other One,' as she calls her husband, all her pen portraits are touched with a pleasant acid. That lady, openly named, is 'conceited'; this was 'not a lady by birth'; while the shadows, as well as the luminous presence of her greater people, as Spencer, Huxley, Joseph Chamberlain, and Creighton, are indicated subtly and with amusement. The main purpose of the book, however, is concerned with social investigation and reform, and Mrs Webb, whatever one may think of her ultimate adoption of State Socialism as her ethical and political creed, proved the courage and sincerity of her convictions; for after experience of life among the industrialists of Bacup and through rent-collecting in the East End, seeking 'the problem of poverty in the midst of riches,' she worked under an assumed name at trouser-making in a sweater's den; experiences not obtained without physical toil as well as moral courage. The usefulness of the book rests in what it shows of social life among the comfortable rich whereto Beatrice Potter was born, and in the sordid and evil conditions of the very poor, which led to much unsettlement and to strikes, more to be justified in those grey, hungry days than now, when Demos has laid a heavy hand, or foot, on the helm of the State. It is, surely, pleasant employment for an Ex-Lord High Chancellor to estimate in his leisure the careers and usefulness of 'Fourteen English Judges' (Cassell), and to write of them as chattily (for that is quite the word) as Lord Birkenhead has done. It is interesting, also, to realise that the two subjects he has best liked studying are Judge Jeffreys and Lord Chancellor Westbury. The former was, of course, a 'blustering and bloody-minded rogue,' deserving lurid adjectives; but Lord Birkenhead, without any authority for doing so, suggests that much of his brutality was 'a deliberate pose' to curry favour with royal James. 'In happier times it may well have been that Jeffreys would have earned a just title to the reverence which is due to the greatest judges.' An assumption not supported by the facts. As to Lord Westbury, 'cynical, fearless, sinister,' Lord Birkenhead evidently delights in him mainly because of his daring and impudent wit. Of the serious judges, the author

pleasantly discriminates. Coke, Eldon, and Somers he ranks among the highest; of Fitzjames Stephen he writes very sympathetically, and incidentally here, as elsewhere, lends glimpses of his own likes and dislikes. Stephen's 'great recreation, as that of Gladstone, was walking, and this dismal liking he transmitted to his children.' Gladstone's favourite pursuit, by the way, was tree-cutting. 'Rumour, in the matter of the earnings of silks is more than usually a lying jade. The Income-Tax Commissioners would perhaps be a safer guide.' Once again much of the interest of a book, as in this case, comes from its reflection of the personality of its writer.

As the title of his work suggests, Dr A. N. Whitehead's '**Science and the Modern World**' (Cambridge University Press) covers an infinite span. From Pythagoras to Einstein, and taking within that stride Aristotle and Plato, Descartes, Galileo, Newton, Locke, and Leibniz, is to touch existence at mighty points and periods, and to arrive at the realisation, through the very wonder, intricacy, diversity, and uniformity of the world, at the ideals which nations and centuries have vaguely, but yet positively, expressed in the name, 'God.' To achieve that 'adventure of the spirit,' that 'flight after the unattainable,' much which has played even a tyrannous part in the 'bagatellé of transient experience,' known as Life, must be yielded up; and it is because movements, causes, facts, faiths, credulities, which in their time seemed significant, are found incapable of enduring the strain of developments, that unsettlement has resulted, and the need has come for a new standard and more exact methods to be applied to 'the secret,' which it is the purpose of Science to unveil. In Dr Whitehead's view the requirement calls for the processes of the mathematician. The book is so compact of wise suggestion and far-reaching in its scope, that no brief notice can be better than as a rapid pointing hand to a motorist flashing by. It merits suggestive study, for it is at once a summary and a starting-place before a new chapter of scientific inquiry is undertaken.

Of simpler and more obvious appeal is Mr Ramsden Balmforth's endeavour in urging '**The Ethical and Religious Value of the Drama**' (Allen & Unwin). Begin-

ing with such outstanding works of the dramatic heart and mind as the Book of Job, the 'Prometheus Bound' of Æschylus, and 'Lear,' the author proceeds to study such modern efforts as Ibsen's 'Peer Gynt' and 'Brand,' Tolstoi's and Mr Galsworthy's sociological plays, Mr Shaw's later and better efforts, and 'The Dynasts.' To a large extent his choice is arbitrary, and the gulf between the earliest and latest plays is almost too wide to treat in one volume; but yet his evidence proves that ever since thoughts have found dramatic expression the stage has exerted a religious and ethical influence of outstanding power. The trouble is that in later days it has lost the old largeness. In the beginning it dealt with the divine; the inevitableness of human failure, the sorrows of heroes, the sadness of the hearts of autocratic kings; whereas now the mightiest actor on the mimic stage is some fretful Napoleon of the little life, or such sentimental criminals as triumph and suffer in Mr Galsworthy's police-ridden plays. At the back of the author's mind is the thought that, compared with the moving force of the great plays for touching the religious heart, what are the conventional pulpits and sermons? Something of that feeling is true; but all pulpits are not wooden; and a good many plays, forgetting the divine purposes, have the solidity of 'A Little Bit of Fluff.'

We remain with a great dramatic theme, for the next work carries us to that early stage of British life when Pagan jostled Christian and monsters abounded. Far too little is read, even by the community of letters, of the vast legacy of literature, heroic and religious, in prose or verse, which was sung and copied in the young days of England; although, in recent years, efforts have been made to revive and make familiar those treasures. The latest of these restorations has been given to us by Prof. Sir Archibald Strong, whose translation of 'Beowulf' (Constable) into vigorous flowing verse, appropriate to the theme, has been introduced by Dr R. W. Chambers. Cordial praise is due to this rimed version which, certainly, with all its necessary diversities from the style of the original, loses nothing of the sweep and energy of the poem. The metre used is a slightly modified form of the long,

swinging rimed couplet, first used with mastery in English by William Morris in 'Sigurd the Volsung,' and, unquestionably, whether Sir Archibald Strong's verses are read aloud or enjoyed in the soundful silence of the mind, they ring. As should be so with poetry of this character, the clashing of sword and axe, the roaring of the monster, the hurtle of battle, and the cries of the warriors, are actual.

A Dictionary written by one hand is a prodigious enterprise, yet it seems that Mr Laurie Magnus has accomplished the task. His '**Dictionary of European Literature**' (Routledge) is no mere compilation of paste, scissors, and intellectual red-tape; but, so far as we have tested, has been freshly put together, while the writing is often pleasant. Of course, with such a bold endeavour there must be occasional misjudgments and slips of opinion and fact. It is, for example, in treating of Guy de Maupassant, absurd to mention his long novels, such as 'Une Vie,' which generally are unwieldy and ill-balanced, and to ignore the short stories that were his greatness. 'Boule de Suif' is one of the finest short stories written. It has no mention here. As to the omissions, Mrs Lynn Linton is in, while J. M. Synge is out; and as to the errors in fact, the John Murray mentioned was not the Founder of the publishing house, but his son; and the business was started in 1768, not in 1812. Moreover, while still our disposition is critical, let us say that the abbreviations are sometimes tiresome. 'Unfind' for 'unfinished' is a poor thing; and there are too many such. They spoil the ease and pleasure of the reading; for often the biographical sketches are excellently put together and phrased, and an intrusive abruptness is a blot. The articles on Rousseau, Irony, Francis Thompson, Flaubert, Tennyson, are among the best. The volume will be so useful that it is a pity mere geographical conditions have kept out the Americans; for such writers as Motley and Hawthorne have added valuably to the body of English—and therefore of European—literature. So why—or why not?

Mr E. M. Nicholson's '**Birds in England**' (Chapman & Hall) is an unusual book, for he reduces sentimentality to less than a minimum, while the sentimentalists who call themselves bird-lovers are legion, and, as he shows

us, too often harmful to the interest they profess to serve. His great concern is to preserve bird-species in England, and to recover so far as possible at this late day the examples which are lost and gone. He would have no molly-coddling; and, while he encourages bird-sanctuaries, would not have them 'edited' by keeping out of them the occasional birds of prey which, after all, are rather dangerous to the unfit than to those which have the strength and wit to escape and endure. He calls for fair play and a free opportunity to eagles, bustards, kites, and the many relations of the hawk, which are persecuted and destroyed, mainly for the sake of the preservation of game; although their existence has the effect of strengthening the normal existence of wild birds. He utters anathema, with justification, against collectors—those worst causes of the destruction of species—bird-catchers, taxidermists, and casual gunners. In his excellent case for sane measures of bird protection he details many interesting facts; as that the comparative disappearance of the swallow is due, not to any fantastic cause, but to the better sanitation, the growth of the use of motors and decrease of horses, and the consequent absence of the flies, their food; also that goldfinches have returned and flourish anew, because the land which has gone out of cultivation tends to produce thistles, the seed of which is their favourite food—evidence that Dame Nature is a wise old mother who, with all her seeming indifference, takes better care of her creatures than clever, opinionated, scientific Man seems able to do.

Sir Hubert Murray's book on 'Papua of To-day' (P. S. King) is significant because simply, and without the banner-waving which is sometimes unhelpful and even hurtful to patriotic feeling, it bears witness to the benevolent administration of a British possession and mandated territory. Papua, like the Gaul of Cæsar's experience, is divided into three parts: Dutch New Guinea, the section which was and is British, and the area that was German before the War; the two latter divisions being now under the authority of Australia, whose methods, based upon British tradition and practice, have proved so excellent that when, some years ago, income tax was demanded of the settlers and they protested that having no representation in the Dominion

Parliament such taxation was unjust, not only was the demand withdrawn but the money already gathered was returned. In view of iron exactions at home, this generosity seems almost too good to be true. Sir Hubert Murray writes with an unromantic pen. He is not under the spell of the tropics, and curiously says next to nothing of the fauna and flora of the country he administers. But he is interested in the natives; and, after all, that is the supreme thing for a colonial minister. That the native shall have justice, and receive the consideration due to him as a human being and a British subject, these are principles accepted and practised by Sir Hubert Murray, so helpfully that, actually, some of the natives have been aggrieved at not being taxed.

It is to be feared that Mr C. Fillingham Coxwell's devoted and scholarly, yet vivid and readable, presentation of 'Siberian and Other Folk Tales' (Daniel) will not win the material reward its due; for the work is most admirably produced, and its fullness of narrative and helpful notes mean many years of research and revision which it must be impossible to repay. The compiler has discovered and brought together examples of primitive literature from all parts of the recent empire of the Tzar; and it is interesting to see how old favourites live in the guise of other lands. Chaucer's and Boccaccio's tale of the Patient Griselda, for instance, is to be found in a very exact form among the Great Russians; while Little Red Riding Hood and other household companions of our own country wander through the woods of many far-sundered districts. With so vast and diversified a work as this, it is impossible to compress—holding eternity in the palm of the hand, in Blake's striking phrase—but it is easy and right to recommend the work; for here is a volume inspiring and instructive to the serious race of folk-lorists, and at the same time rich with jolly imaginative tales for the amusement of the weary and the recreation of the young and the not-so-young. The index is not without its humour, as 'Husband and Wife, *see* Domestic Strife.'



# INDEX

TO THE

## TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[*Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.*]

### A.

- Abercrombie, Lascelles, character of his poetry, 144.  
Aberdeen, Earl of, 'We Twa,' 162.  
'A C. Mery Talys,' 109.  
Adam, Mr. on the statute law of Scotland, 356.  
Adams, Charles Francis, American Minister in London, 379—reception by the British society, 380.  
'Adams, Henry, The Education of,' 380.  
Adams, John, preference for the British to the French, 366.  
Adams, Dr R. G., 'Political Ideas of the American Revolution,' 358.  
Admiralty Office, cost, 418—system of administration, 418—426—staff of civil servants, 419—421—mode of conducting business, 422—position of the Second Sea Lord, 424—the Fourth Sea Lord, 425—measures of reform, 426.  
Agriculture Act of 1920.. 154.  
Alexander III, Emperor of Russia, death, 189.  
Alexandra, H.M. Queen, relations with Queen Victoria, 219—221, 243.  
Allen, John, 'Royal Prerogative,' 346.  
Almedingen, Miss Edith M., 'The English Pope, Adrian IV,' 216.  
Alsace-Lorraine, result to France of the acquisition, 319.  
Animals, importance of food, 324—result of feeding on proteins, 326.  
Vol. 246.—No. 488.

'Apologia pro vita sua,' 83.

- Architecture, New and Old, 1—27.  
Art Workers' Guild, 9.  
Arts and Crafts Society, 9.  
Ash or mineral substances, 325—327.  
Ault, Norman, 'Elizabethan Lyrics,' 215.

### B.

- Bagot, Charles, British Minister at Washington, 368.  
Bagwell, Richard, 'History of Ireland in Tudor and Stuart Times,' 93.  
Bailey, John, 'Queen Victoria,' 219.  
Balmforth, Ramsden, 'The Ethical and Religious Value of the Drama,' 432.  
Barbi, Michele, 'Studi Danteschi,' 331 *note*, 337 *note*.  
Bargello portrait of Dante, 331.  
Barnes, Arthur Stapylton, 'Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders,' 406.  
Baroque art, definition, 19—origin, 24.  
Baty, Dr, 'Bellicist Theory of State Structure,' 361.  
Bees, case of, 48.  
Bela Kun episode in Hungary, 131.  
Bellot, Hugh H. L., 'The Rule of Law,' 346.  
Benson, Miss Stella, 'The Little World,' 210.  
Bernini, G., character of his art, 21.

- Bethlen, Count, Prime Minister of Hungary, 126—on its reconstruction, 127—characteristics, 128.
- Bevan, Edwyn*, 'Classical Ghosts,' 60.
- Biology and Social Hygiene, 28-48.
- Birkenhead, Earl of, 'Fourteen English Judges,' 431.
- Birmingham, George A., 'A Wayfarer in Hungary,' 125.
- Birth Control, objections to, 41-44.
- Bismarck, Prince, character, 224—duplicity, 228—policy, 229.
- Blackcock, the, 262.
- Blomfield, Sir Reginald*, 'Architecture, New and Old,' 1.
- Blum, M. Léon, financial policy, 308.
- Blunden, Edmund, war-poems, 147, 153.
- Bonham's Case*, 351.
- Books, Some Recent, 209-218, 428-436.
- Booth, General Bramwell, 'Echoes and Memories,' 429.
- Bread, white, result of eating, 327.
- Briand, M., Prime Minister, policy, 312, 315.
- Bridges, Robert, poems, 140.
- Brooke, Rupert, sonnets, 141, 146—character of his poetry, 144—death, 145.
- Browning, Robert, meeting with Queen Victoria, 242.
- Bryce, Viscount, 'The American Commonwealth,' 379.
- 'Bubble and Squeak,' 120.
- Buckle, George Earle, 'The Letters of Queen Victoria,' edited by, 219, 222.
- Budge, Sir E. A. Wallis, 'One Hundred and Ten Miracles of Our Lady Mary,' 213.
- Burgess, Prof., on the growth of autocracy in the United States, 361.
- Bybus, P. J., opinion of the British engineering workmen, 250.
- C.**
- Caillaux, M., on the system of taxation in France, 304—Minister of Finance, 312.
- Camden, Lord, on the Declaratory Act, 355.
- Canterbury and York Society, members, 400—publications, 401.
- Carlyle, Thomas, criticism on, 242.
- Carnarvon, Earl of, protest against the creation of elective Irish Peers, 356.
- Carrà, Signor Carlo, 'Giotto,' 334.
- Carson, Lord, character of his speeches, 102.
- Central Landowners' Association, proposals, 172.
- Chamberlin, Frederick, 'The Wit and Wisdom of Queen Bess,' 215.
- Chicago, National Prohibition Party, 177.
- Church, Dean, on the character of Cardinal Newman, 79.
- Churchill, Rt Hon. W., 'The World Crisis,' 419.
- Classical Ghosts, 60-74.
- Clémentel, M., *Inventaire* of 1924, 304, 306.
- Coalition Ministry, formed, 396.
- Coggs v. Bernard* case, 349.
- Coke, Sir Edward, on reason the life of the law, 348—Common Law, 351.
- Conservative Party, measures of social reform, 392.
- Corn Production Acts (Repeal) Act, 154.
- Coxwell, C. Fillingham, 'Siberian and Other Folk Tales,' 436.
- D.**
- D. H., poems, 149.
- Dante and Giotto, 331-345.
- Davidson, John, poems, 140.
- Davies, W. H., poems, 145, 152.
- Daubeny, Rev. E. T., anecdote of the French partridge, 261.
- Defence of the Realm Act, 362.
- 'Dialogue of the Doctor and Student,' 350.
- Dickens, Charles, 'American Notes,' 372—'Martin Chuzzlewit,' 373.
- Diseases, various forms of, 30.
- Disraeli, Rt Hon. B., Public Worship Regulation Act, 234—'Coningsby,' 242—relations with Queen Victoria, 243.

- Doumer, M., Minister of Finance, policy, 314.  
 Dow, Neal, Father of Prohibition, 176.  
 Ductless glands, discovery, 36.

E.

- 'Economist,' extracts from, 303, 310.  
 Education, biological, 44-47.  
 Edward VII, H.M. King, relations with Queen Victoria, 220, 240-242.  
 Efficiency in work, value, 52.  
 Eliot, T. S., 'The Waste Land,' 150.  
 Ellesmere, Lord Chancellor, 'Observations on the Reports,' 351.  
 Emerson, R. W., impressions of England, 374.  
 Employees, Profit-Sharing and Share-Purchase for, 49-59.  
 Engineering Industry, What ails the P 247-253.  
 England, number of acres of cultivated land, 160.  
 Ernie, Lord, 'The Land and its People,' 173.  
 Esher Committee, criticism of the War Office system of finance, 423, 427.  
 Estate Management, Good, 154-175.  
 Eugenics, practical, 40.

F.

- Figgis, Rev. J. N., 'Divine Right of Kings,' 346.  
 Flecker, James Elroy, poems, 145-death, *ib.*  
 Food, Health, and Strength, Thoughts on, 323-330.  
 Foord, Edward, 'The Last Age of Roman Britain,' 212.  
 Foreign Office despatches, 237.  
 France, the, and French Taxation, 294-322.  
 France, result of the acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine, 319.  
 Frazer, Sir James G., 'Pausanias's Description of Greece,' 62.

- Freeman, Prof. E. A., 'History of Federal Government from the Foundation of the Achaean League to the Disruption of the United States,' 378.

Fremantle, Dean, objections to birth control, 42.

French Taxation and the Franc, 294-322.

Frere, Dr Walter Howard, 'A History of the Church of England,' 401.

Friendship, The, of Great Britain and the United States, 366-383.

Froude, J. A., description of Cardinal Newman, 75.

G.

- Germany, Biblical Criticism, 85.  
 Ghent, Treaty of, 367.  
 Ghosts, Classical, 60-74.  
 Gibson, W. W., character of his poetry, 144.  
 Giotto and Dante, 331-345.  
 Gladstone, Rt Hon. W. E., Irish Disestablishment Bill, 233-relations with Queen Victoria, 244-character of his foreign policy, 388-390.  
 Goode, Sir William, 'Hungary of To-day,' 122.  
 Gordon, Douglas, 'The Partridge,' 259.  
 Granville, Earl, relations with Queen Victoria, 232, 243.  
 Graves, Robert, poems, 153.  
 Great Britain and the United States, The Friendship of, 366-383.

H.

- Haddo Estate, amount of taxation, 162.  
 Hadley, A. T., President Emeritus of Yale University, on the system of log-rolling, 363.  
 Hall, Captain Basil, impressions of North America, 368.  
 Hardie, W. R., 'Lectures on Classical Subjects,' 60.  
 Hardy, Thomas, character of his poetry, 143.

Harvey, George, on the friendship between Great Britain and the United States, 382.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel, American Consul at Liverpool, 375—'Our Old Home,' *ib.*

Hazell, W. Howard, 'Profit-Sharing and Share-Purchase for Employees,' 49.

Health, good, value of, 34-36—recommendations, 39.

Health, Strength, and Food, Thoughts on, 323-330.

Herriot, M., on the financial deficit, 307.

Hichens, W. L., on the engineering industry, 249.

Hill, Mr., 'Leading American Treaties,' 367.

Holbrook, Richard Thyayer, 'Portraits of Dante from Giotto to Raffael,' 331 *note*.

Holmes, Oliver W., 'Autocrat of the Breakfast Table,' 376.

Holt, Chief Justice, appeals to reason as the basis of the law, 349.

'Home and Foreign Review,' the, 277.

Horthy, Admiral, Regent of Hungary, 129.

Housman, A. E., 'Shropshire Lad,' 143.

Hughes, Secretary, on the spirit of the Common Law, 364.

'Hundred Merry Tales,' 111-114.

Hungary of To-day, 122-138.

Hutchinson, George T., 'Good Estate Management,' 154.

Hutton, W. H., 'The Register of Archbishop Parker,' 400.

Hygiene, Biology and Social, 28-48.

## I.

Inge, Dean, objections to birth control, 42.

Irish Disestablishment Bill, 233.

Irish History since the Union, 93-104.

Irving, Washington, 'Bracebridge Hall,' 373—impressions of England, 374.

## J.

Jackson, Sir T. Graham, 'Architecture a Profession or an Art,' edited by, 7.

Jenkins, Claude, 'Bishop Barlow's Consecration and Archbishop Parker's Register,' 407.

Jerrold, Walter, 'The English Jest-Book,' 105.

Jest-Book, The English, 105-121.

Jews, treatment in Hungary, 133.

'Joe Miller's Jests: or, the Wits Vade-Mecum,' 119.

Johnson, Nicolas, friendship with the Grand Duke Michael, 190—imprisoned in Smolney, 201—letter to Princess Poutiatine, 204—murdered, 208.

Judges, conception of the nature of law, 348.

## K.

Károlyi, Count Michael, President of the Republic of Hungary, 130.

Keble, Rev. John, influence on Cardinal Newman, 87.

Kennedy, Prof. W. M., 'Archbishop Parker,' 402.

Kennedy, Sir Alexander, 'Petra, Its History and Monuments,' 213.

Kerensky, interview with the Grand Duke Michael, 195, 197.

Kings, Divine Right of, theory, 346.

Kingsley, Rev. Charles, reply from Cardinal Newman, 288.

Kite trick, device, 226.

## L.

Labour Party, formation, 393—policy, 398.

Land agents, work of the, 164—salary, *ib.*

Land, number of acres of cultivated, 160.

Landowners, agricultural, result of proposals to abolish, 158-160—relations with tenants, 167, 173.

Landseer, Sir Edwin, popularity, 242.

Lane, Sir W. Arbuthnot, 'Thoughts on Food, Health, and Strength,' 323.

- Law, The Rule of, 346-365.  
 Lawrence, D. H., lines from, 149.  
 'Lecky, Life of,' extract from, 281  
*note*.  
 Lee, Sir Sidney, 'Life of Edward  
 VII,' 240.  
 Lemon, Mark, 'The Jest-Book,' 120.  
 Leopold I, King of the Belgians,  
 unique position, 224—advice to  
 Queen Victoria, 237.  
 Lewis, Cleona, 'The French Debt  
 Problem,' 294.  
 Lhassa, the Potala at, 7.  
 Liberal Party, The Passing of the,  
 384-399.  
 Liebig, nutritional doctrines, 325.  
 Lloyd George, Rt Hon. D., un-  
 popularity, 384—Old Age Pensions  
 Measure, 392.  
 Locarno, Pact of, 230.  
 Long, Mr, 'The Partridge's Roll-call,'  
 270.  
 Loucheur, M., Minister of Finance,  
 policy, 306, 312.  
 Lowell, James Russell, 'The Govern-  
 ment of England,' 379.  
 Lucas, E. V., 'A Wanderer in  
 Florence,' 332 *note*.  
 Lyell, Sir C., 'Principles of Geology,'  
 85.

M.

- Macdonald, A. J., 'Lanfranc,' 430.  
 Maeterlinck, M., 'Ancient Egypt,'  
 214.  
 Magnus, Laurie, 'Dictionary of  
 European Literature,' 434.  
 Magyar language, the, 122.  
 Maitland, F. W., 'Gierke's Political  
 Theories of the Middle Ages,' 349.  
 Mallet, Bernard, 'French Taxation  
 and the Franc,' 294.  
 Mansfield, Lord, on the Common  
 Law, 351.  
 Mare, Walter de la, poems, 145, 152.  
 Mark, Dr Raimund van, 'The De-  
 velopment of the Italian Schools  
 of Painting,' 338.  
 Mellwaine, Prof., 'High Court of  
 Parliament,' 347, 356, 358.

- Marriott, Charles, 'Modern English  
 Architecture,' 8.  
 Marryat, Captain, 'Diary in America,'  
 374.  
 Marsh, Mr, 'Georgian Poetry,' 143.  
 Martineau, Harriet, 'Retrospect of  
 Western Travel,' 370.  
 Masfield, John, 'Everlasting Mercy,'  
 143—character of his poetry, 144.  
 Melgounov, Sergev P., 'The Red  
 Terror in Russia,' 218.  
 Melmoth, William, 'The Letters of  
 Pliny,' translated by, 67.  
 'Merry Tales and Quicke Answers,'  
 109, 117.  
 Miasnikoff, murders the Grand Duke  
 Michael, 208.  
 Michael, the Grand Duke, The  
 Last Days of, 189-208.  
 Mond, Sir Alfred, secession from the  
 Liberal Party, 384.  
 Monro, Harold, poems, 145.  
 Morel, M. Compère, statement on  
 finance, 300.  
 Motley, J. L., 'Dutch Republic,' 376  
 —impressions of England, *ib.*—  
 'United Netherlands,' 377.  
 Moulton, Harold (G.), 'The French  
 Debt Problem,' 296 *et seq.*  
 Mowat, R. B., 'The Friendship of  
 Great Britain and the United  
 States,' 366.  
 Mozley, Anne, 'Letters and Corre-  
 spondence of J. H. Newman,'  
 edited by, 75.  
 Mozley, J. F., 'Newman's Oppor-  
 tunity,' 75—'Newman in Fetters,'  
 272.  
 Mozley, T., 'Reminiscences of Oriel,'  
 291.  
 Murray, Sir Herbert, 'Papua of To-  
 day,' 435.

N.

- National Prohibition Act, or the  
 Volstead Act, 178.  
 Nature, wild, contrast with civilised  
 society, 31.  
 Naval Incubus, The Real, 416-427.  
 Navy, the, construction, 416—mea-  
 sures of economies, 417—strength,  
*ib.*

New England settlers, principles of Common Law, 353.

New Health Society, founded, 330.

Newman in Fetters, 272-293.

Newman's Opportunity, 75-92.

'New York Times,' 'Ultimi Britannii,' extract from, 383.

Nicholas II, Emperor of Russia, assassinated, 189—abdication, 194-196.

Nichols, Robert, 'Ardours and Endurances,' 153.

Nicholson, E. M., 'Birds in England,' 434.

## O.

O'Connell, Daniel, characteristics, 94.

O'Connor, Rt Hon. Sir James, 'History of Ireland, 1798-1924,' 93.

Ohio, Anti-Saloon League, 177.

Orwin, C. S., Director of the Institute of Agricultural Economics, 155—'The Tenure of Agricultural Land,' *ib.*

Oxford and Asquith, Earl of, character of his leadership of the Liberal Party, 384.

## P.

Page, Walter, on good government, 317.

Page, Walter Hines, impressions of the English, 381—character of his letters, 382.

Parker, Archbishop, The Register of, 400-415.

Parliament, the Supremacy theory of, 346.

Parnell, Charles Stewart, personality, 97—hatred of England, 98—contrast with the 'Times,' 99.

Partridge, The, 259-271.

Passerini, G. L., 'Il Ritratto di Dante,' 331 *note*.

Passing of the Liberal Party, The, 384-399.

Pearce, Dr, lecture on Archbishop Parker, 402.

Peel, Hon. George, 'The Financial Crisis in France,' 296 *et seq.*

Peel, Lieut-Col W. R., University Lecturer in Agriculture at Oxford, 155—'The Tenure of Agricultural Land,' *ib.*

Pells, S. F., 'The Church's Ancient Bible,' 217.

Pembrey, Prof., objections to birth control, 42.

People's Budget, repeal of the, 396.

Pisano, Niccola, the sculptor, 340, 342.

Pitt, Rt Hon. William, on the sinecure offices, 356.

Pius IX, 'Syllabus Errorum,' 286.

Plants, nutrition, 323.

Pliny, The Letters of, 66.

Poetry, The 'New,' 1911-1925: A Survey, 139-153.

Poutiatine, Princess, 'The Last Days of the Grand Duke Michael,' 189—receives him, 193, 199—letter from Mr. Johnson, 204.

Powell, Mr Justice, on the reason of the case, 348.

Privy Councillor, A, 'The Passing of the Liberal Party,' 384.

Profit-Sharing and Share-Purchase for Employees, 49-59.

Prohibition, 176-188.

'Prohibition Situation, The,' Bulletin on the, 176, 179-188.

Public Health Act of 1875..392.

Public Worship Regulation Act, 233.

Pucci, Antonio, on the date of Giotto's birth, 331.

## R.

Radical Party, policy of non-intervention, 385-387.

'Rambler,' the, 276.

Ramsay, A. A. W., 'Idealism and Foreign Policy,' 224 *et seq.*

Rastell, John, 'A C. Mery Talys,' 114—'The Widow Edyth,' 116.

Reason, the basis of the law, 349—meaning of the word, *ib.*

Register of Archbishop Parker, The, 400-415.

Ricci, Corrado, on the term 'Baroque art,' 19.



Robertson, Manning, 'Laymen and the New Architecture,' 2-8.

Rochal, the Bolshevik commissary, 119.

Rodizanko, M., President of the Douma, 192.

Rosebery, Earl of, 'The Last Phase,' 225.

Ross, Rt Hon. Sir John, 'Irish History since the Union,' 93.

Rule of Law, The, 346-365.

Rural Report of the Liberal Land Committee, 157.

Rush, Richard, American Minister in England, 367.

Russell, Lord John, foreign policy, 388.

# S.

St Louis, increase in the treatments in the Venereal Clinic, 182.

St Simon, Duc de, on taxation, 294, 320.

Sanger, 'Lord' George, 'Seventy Years a Showman,' 428.

Sassoon, Mr, sonnets, 147.

Scartazzini, 'Dantologia,' 334.

Scott, Geoffrey, 'The Architecture of Humanism,' 4, 11-17.

Setters or pointers, use of, 268-270.

Shanks, Edward, 'The "New Poetry," 1911-1925: A Survey,' 139.

Share-Purchase and Profit-Sharing for Employees, 49-59.

Shaw, R. Norman, work on architecture, 2, 9—designs New Scotland Yard, 3—'Architecture: A Profession or an Art,' edited by, 7.

Sinn Fein movement, 100.

Sirén, Oswald, 'Giotto and Some of his Followers,' 331 note.

Sitwell, Edith, poems, 151.

Sitwell, Sacheverel, 'Southern Baroque Art,' 17-21.

Smith, Jeremiah, Commissioner-General, administration of the reconstruction plan in Hungary, 134.

Smyth, H. Warrington, 'Sea-Wake and Jungle Trail,' 211.

Some Recent Books, 209-218, 428-436.

Sovereignty, the term, 357.

Stewart v. Lawton case, 352.

Stockbreeding, result, 168-170.

Stra, the Palazzo Pisani at, 22, 23.

Strength, Food, and Health, Thoughts on, 323-330.

Strong, Prof. Sir Archibald, 'Beowulf' translated by, 433.

# T.

Taylor, John, 'Wit and Mirth,' 117, 119.

Tchelichev, Basil, valet to the Grand Duke Michael, 205, 207.

Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, appearance, 242.

Thompson, Francis, poems, 140.

Thomson, Prof. J. Arthur, 'Biology and Social Hygiene,' 28.

Thoughts on Food, Health, and Strength, 323-330.

Tocqueville, Alexis de, on the danger of majority rule in the American Constitution, 360.

Trades Disputes Act, 394.

Trench, Herbert, poems, 140.

Trollope, Anthony, 'North America,' 377.

Trollope, Mrs Frances, 'Domestic Manners of the Americans,' 369, 377.

Turner, W. J., 'Landscape of Cythera,' 153—'The Seven Days of the Sun,' *ib.*

# U.

United States and Great Britain, The Friendship of, 366-383.

United States, treatment of mechanics, 250—Constitution, 358—danger of majority rule, 360—growth of autocracy, 361—emergency legislation in the war, 363—system of log-rolling, *ib.*

# V.

Vattel, 'Law of Nations,' 354 note.

Venturi, 'Storio dell' Arte Italiana Milan,' 332 note.

Versailles, Treaty of, 231.  
 Victoria, Queen, 219-246.  
 Vitamins, meaning of the word, 326.  
 Volstead Act, or the National Prohibition Act, 178.  
 Voulfert, Nathalie Sergueyevna, marriage, 190—imprisonment of her husband, 201—interview with him, 202—treatment by Trotsky, 204—letter from the Grand Duke Michael, *ib.*—at Perm, 205—arrested, 206.

## W.

War, the Great, result on the Liberal Party, 395.  
 War Office, system of finance, criticism on, 423—reforms, 424.  
 Ward, Wilfrid, 'Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman,' 78.  
 Ward, W. G., on the influence of Cardinal Newman, 79—opinion of the 'Syllabus Errorum,' 286.  
 Watson, Mrs., 'Coleridge at Highgate,' 209.  
 Watson, W. F., 'What ails the Engineering Industry?' 247.  
 Webb, Mrs Beatrice, 'My Apprenticeship,' 430.  
 Webb, Philip, influence on architecture, 9.  
 Wells v. Williams case, 352.  
 What ails the Engineering Industry? 247-258.  
 Whigs, the, policy, 385, 387.  
 White, Gilbert, on the extinct blackcock, 262.  
 Whitehead, Dr A. N., 'Science and the Modern World,' 432.  
 Willecocks, Miss M. P., 'Between the Old Worlds and the New,' 210.  
 Williams-Ellis, A. and C., 'The Pleasures of Architecture,' 9.  
 Wilson, James, on the reason of common law, 349.  
 Woermann, Dr Karl, 'Geschichte Kunst,' 331 *note*.  
 Wood, Rt Hon. E. F. L., on the disappearance of the landowner, 155.  
 Workshops, faults in the management, 254-257—suggested remedies, 257.  
 Wright, W. J. Payling, 'Dante and Giotto,' 331.

## Y.

Yeats, W. B., poems, 140—'Early Poems and Stories,' 217.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH VOLUME.

# THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

Founded by Sir James Knowles, and now edited by George A. B. Dewar, The Nineteenth Century and After has, from its earliest issues, been universally regarded as the leading review of the world.

The scope of its contents is world-wide. The leading statesmen of England and Europe frequently contribute to its pages, and its long history is illuminated with many articles of universal fame. It is impossible to keep in touch with the great movements of the day, to acquire familiarity with the trend of the best thought of the time, to keep abreast of current affairs of real moment without constant reference to its brilliant pages.

Published monthly in its original English form—not a reprint—it costs \$7.00 per year; 75 cents per single copy. Subscribe only to the "Leonard Scott Edition."

## **Annual Subscription and Combination Prices:**

The Nineteenth Century and After, The Fortnightly Review, The Contemporary Review. Each per year, \$7.00. Any two, \$13.50. The three reviews, \$20.00.

Blackwood's Magazine, The Quarterly Review, The Edinburgh Review. Each per year, \$5.00. Any two \$9.50. The three, \$13.50.

*All original editions; no reprints.*

**LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.**  
249 WEST 13th STREET NEW YORK

# Why Pay More?

---

The Nineteenth Century & After, The Fortnightly Review, The Contemporary Review, Blackwood's Magazine, Edinburgh Review, Quarterly Review.

These famous periodicals, supplied by the Leonard Scott Publication Co., are the original issues circulated in England, printed from the same plates and on the same paper as the British copies. Yet a substantial saving in price is effected.

Librarians and others interested in keeping down their expenses should specify Leonard Scott Editions for all these periodicals as a part of their economy program.

## Annual Subscriptions and Combination Rates

		U. S.	CANADA
Nineteenth Century	<i>any one</i>	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.35
Contemporary Review	<i>any two</i>	13.50	14.00
Fortnightly Review	<i>all three</i>	20.00	21.00
Blackwood's Magazine	<i>any one</i>	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00
Edinburgh Review	<i>any two</i>	9.50	9.50
Quarterly Review	<i>all three</i>	13.50	13.50

---

**Leonard Scott Publication Company**

**249 West 13th Street    ::    ::    New York**

*Del. N.Y.*

